DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 075 520 UD 013 423

AUTHOR	Sloane, Martin E., Ed.
TITLE	Title IV and School Desegregation: A Study of a Neglected Federal Program.
INSTITUTION	Commission on Civil Rights, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Jan 73
NOTE	192p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402 (Stock Number 0500-00085, $2.35)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	Civil Rights; Federal Aid; Federal Programs; Institutes (Training Programs); Integration Methods; *Integration Studies; *Program Administration; *Program Evaluation; Racial Integration; School Districts; *School Integration; School Systems; State Departments of Education
IDENTIFIERS	*Civil Rights Act Title IV

ABSTRACT

In general, civil rights staff in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare have agreed that Title IV, 1964 Civil Rights Act grants should support Title VI enforcement efforts by providing a carrot of Title IV money to complement the stick of Title VI enforcement. How best to utilize Title IV grants for this purpose, however, has been the subject of continuing disagreement. From the beginning of the program, some officials have argued that local Title IV programs should focus on educational problems which may become visible in the process of desegregation. Other staff members have contended that the emphasis should be on desegregation per se and that local programs funded under Title IV should help build understanding across lines and improve interpersonal relations. In its examination of Title IV, the Commission has concentrated its investigation on the Southern and border States where the bulk of Title IV funds have gone. The Commission also has investigated the operation of the program in New Mexico, where some program innovations have been undertaken which seemed to merit special consideration. In examining the role of Title IV as a facilitator of the desegregation process, the Commission has looked at programs developed by individual school districts, training institutes, and desegregation centers established in colleges and universities, and at Title IV units in State departments of education. (Author/JM)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 075520

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

TITLE IV AND SCHOOL DESEGREGATION

A Study of a Neglected Federal Program

January 1973

UD 013423

A Report of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights

U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights is a temporary, independent, bipartisan Agency established by Congress in 1957 and directed to:

Investigate complaints alleging that citizens are being deprived of their right to vote by reason of their race, color, religion, or national origin, or by reason of fraudulent practices;

Study and collect information concerning legal developments constituting a denial of equal protection of the laws under the Constitution because of race, color, religion sex or national origin;

Appraise Federal laws and policies with respect to equal protection of the laws because of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin;

Serve as a national clearinghouse for information in respect to denials of equal protection of the laws because of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin; and

Submit reports, finding, and recommendations to the President and the Congress.

Members of the Commission:

Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., *Chairman*
Stephen Horn, *Vice Chairman*
Frankie M. Freeman
Maurice B. Mitchell
Robert S. Rankin
Manuel Ruiz, Jr.

John A. Buggs, *Staff Director*

CR 1.2: Sch 6/17

ED 075520

TITLE IV AND SCHOOL DESEGREGATION

A Study of a Neglected Federal Program

A Report of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents,
U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402
Price $2.35 domestic postpaid or $2 GPO Bookstore
Stock Number 0500-00005

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

THE U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS
WASHINGTON, D.C.
March 1973

THE PRESIDENT
THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE
THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Sirs:

The Commission on Civil Rights presents this report to you pursuant to Public Law 85–315, as amended.

Recognizing the potential of Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 for developing a program that could assist in the orderly transition from a segregated to a desegregated school system in the country, the Commission undertook a study of that Title.

The study revealed that Title IV represented an area of neglect. It had been relegated to the status of a minor program, allocated insufficient money with which to function well, indifferently staffed, and, consequently, remained immobile. It cannot be called a failure. It has never really been tried.

But the study showed that, despite areas of resistance, the country is receptive to the idea of school desegregation. The Commission believes that Title IV can become an effective instrument in achieving successful school desegregation if its import is realized and if its program is adequately financed and wisely administered.

We urge your consideration of the facts presented and your cooperation in effecting the Commission's recommendations.

Respectfully yours,

Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., *Chairman*
Stephen Horn, *Vice Chairman*
Frankie M. Freeman
Maurice B. Mitchell
Robert S. Rankin
Manuel Ruiz, Jr.

John A. Buggs, *Staff Director*

ACKNOWLEGMENTS

The Commission is indebted to the following staff members and former staff members who participated in the preparation of this report under the direction of Caroline F. Davis, Chief, Education Division, Office of Civil Rights Program and Policy: Mary F. J. Abdalla,* Klaire V. Adkins,* Doris Barnes,* Mary E. Bibb, Lucille L. Boston, Doris Chambers, Rodney J. Cash, Patricia A. Cheatham, Joseph R. Cooney,* Cecilia E. Cosca, Ruby T. Daniels, Lelia Findley,* Wallace Greene, Eunice Grier,* Bessie Heggs*, Judith L. Lichtman,* Carolyn O'Neal,* Nadine Price, Ulysses Prince III, John F. Sencindiver,* Beatrice W. Tootle, Addison N. Wallace,* Brenda A. Watts, David I. Weiss,* Carole Williams,* and Janie V. Young.*

The report was prepared under the overall supervision of Martin E. Sloane, Assistant Staff Director, Office of Civil Rights Program and Policy Review.

* *No longer on Commission staff.*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Letter of Transmittal

Acknowledgments

Chapter I. Introduction

Chapter II. State Departments of Education

Chapter III. Local Educational Agencies

Chapter IV. University Desegregation Centers

Chapter V. Conclusion

Chapter VI. Recommendations Appendices

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The 1954 Supreme Court decision holding legally compelled or sanctioned public school segregation unconstitutional[1] marked a decisive turning point in the legal battle to assure equal rights for minorities. The Court expressly recognized that "separate educational facilities are inherently unequal" and from that time it was clear that equality in any area of significant governmental involvement could not constitutionally be achieved on the basis of racial separation. From that time also the legal obligation of Southern and border school systems to desegregate their schools was clear.

During the decade that followed the landmark *Brown* decision, however, the right to a desegregated education remained largely one established in legal theory but not in fact. During the 10-year period between 1954 and 1964, many desegregation lawsuits were filed, numerous court decrees were issued, but little school desegregation occurred.[2]

In 1964, the Nation turned in a different direction from that of private lawsuits in the effort to redeem the promise of the *Brown* decision. In July of that year, Congress passed the most comprehensive civil rights law since the days of Reconstruction and opened the way for a renewed and vigorous effort toward desegregation. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 established three related mechanisms for accelerating the school desegregation process.

Title VI, which prohibits discrimination in the distribution of benefits from any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance, utilizes the leverage of Federal education funds as a means of bringing about desegregation. Failure to comply with nondiscrimination requirements of Title VI may result in termination of Federal education assistance following elaborate administrative enforcement procedures.[3]

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 also provides in Title IV for lawsuits by the Department of Justice to require desegregation. Thus, even if school systems are willing to deprive themselves of the benefits of Federal funds for the sake of maintaining segregation, lawsuits by the Attorney General will require them to desegregate and render their acts of defiance an exercise in futility.

Title VI also established a third approach: that of Federal financial assistance to school districts to help them overcome problems incident to desegregation. Under this Title, grants may be made to local school boards for teacher training or for hiring technical specialists; they may also be made to State departments of education for programs of technical assistance. In addition, provision is made for grants or contracts with institutions of higher education for training programs and other technical aid to local districts.

In the congressional debate concerning financial and technical assistance provided under Title IV of the bill, Paul Douglas, then a United States Senator from Illinois, a major proponent of the bill, spoke definitively about the need for desegregating school districts and of the potential importance of Title IV's provisions:

> They establish a commitment by the entire Nation to insure adequate education to all its children. It is in every respect right that we not wash our hands of the many problems in the South and in the North as a result of desegregation; for no part of the Nation is free of responsibility for the present condition of education among the poor, and the disinherited.[4]

The new mechanism for desegregation established in the Civil Rights Act of 1964 has begun to achieve noticeable results. Progress in desegregation has accelerated in the South so that today, all-black and all-white schools are the exception, not the rule.

Of these three mechanisms, two are concerned with enforcement through administrative proceedings leading to fund cutoffs and lawsuits by the Department of

[1] *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka*, 347 U.S. 483 (1954).

[2] During this 10-year period only about 3 percent desegregation was accomplished. U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Staff Report: *Public Education*, 1964, Appendix 2 at 290.

[3] In FY 1971 an estimated $1.85 billion in Federal funds helped support activities of local school districts under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Federal money also supports provision of school library resources, textbooks and other instructional materials, and supplementary educational centers and services. Other major Federal programs of aid to education include Federal financial assistance to school systems in federally impacted areas, research grants and fellowship awards, manpower development and training activities, cooperative vocational education, and higher educational facilities.

[4] 110 Cong. Rec. 6828 (1964).

Justice. The third, contained in Title IV, takes a different direction by offering technical and financial assistance to help school systems through the often difficult process of desegregation. This mechanism, unlike the other two, is concerned with *facilitating* desegregation, not enforcing it. The way in which this mechanism has worked is the subject of this report.

Early Years of Title IV

Civil Rights Legislation Planning Group

The overall emphasis and direction of the Title IV program was largely determined before Title IV was even enacted. In 1963, when passage of civil rights legislation was anticipated, the U.S. Commissioner of Education appointed a Civil Rights Legislation Planning Group to make recommendations on the way the pending Title IV could be implemented most effectively. The Group, known informally as the Luddington Task Force after its Chairman, John Luddington, who was then Special Assistant to the Commissioner of Education, produced its report later that year and made a number of recommendations which were to provide the framework for the operation of Title IV.

Among its major recommendations was that the technical assistance offered under Title IV be concerned with a "problem oriented approach" to eliminate segregation and educational disadvantage. That is, in the Task Force's view, Title IV efforts were to focus on actual problems likely to be encountered in the course of school desegregation rather than on general sociological issues.[5] The "problem oriented approach", however, was conceived broadly to include problems of human relations and techniques for teaching disadvantaged children and was not limited specifically to problems of desegregation.[6] The Task Force recommendation, while it constituted recognition of the fact that there were likely to be a wide variety of problems involved in the desegregation process, also had the effect of giving tacit approval to funding programs that were not concerned directly with school desegregation.

The use of consultants in the provision of technical assistance was another major Task Force recommendation that had important implications on the future success of the Title IV program. In the Task Force's view, these consultants could be key elements in enabling local school systems to overcome the many problems they would face in accomplishing desegregation. Among the services which it was believed they might provide was to give advice on ways in which the community could become an active participant in the desegregation process through such means as the formation of citizens' advisory groups and interracial councils. Consultants also were expected to provide such other forms of technical assistance as developing pupil transportation plans, revising methods for determining school plant locations, and establishing workable procedures for class assignments and pupil guidance. In addition, it was hoped consultants could contribute to improving intergroup relations in the community-at-large as well as in the school.[7]

In light of the sensitive and important mission conceived for consultants, the Task Force recommended not only that they possess the necessary competence, but that they be individuals known and respected by school administrators and community leaders in the region to which they were assigned. In this way, it was thought, the problems involved in bringing in "outsiders" could be avoided and the path of desegregation smoothed. The use of indigenous personnel, however, also meant that consultants would often be individuals who themselves were products of a dual school system and whose background and training might tend to make them unsympathetic with the principle of desegregation. In addition, they would be subject to a variety of political pressures which could render their efforts cautious and tentative.

Independent Status for Title IV

In the early years of the Equal Educational Opportunities Program (EEOP), following passage of the 1964 Act, the Title IV program was given little attention. The major, almost exclusive, focus of the Federal school desegregation effort was on use of the enforcement mechanism of Title IV. Its subordinate role in this period is partly evident from its various locations within the program structure.[8] Initially, Title IV staff was lodged in an overall training branch. Later it was housed with Title VI staff in units broken down into regional alignments.[9] It was not until 1967 that the Title IV unit was established as a separate entity.

The reallocation of staff positions authorized for Title IV to the effort launched under Title VI was still another indication of the minor role assigned to Title IV during these early years.[10] For example, during 1965 every available member of the Title IV staff was pressed into service to secure "voluntary plan" submissions from local school districts. Nearly all staff of the

[5] Civil Rights Legislation Planning Group Report at 1 (1963).
[6] *Id.*, at 20-21.
[7] *Id.* at 13.
[8] Internal U.S. Office of Education Memorandum, *Undated*.
[9] *Id.* at 2.
[10] *Id.* at 2.

Equal Educational Opportunity Program (EEOP) of the Office of Education was committed to the effort to negotiate initial desegregation plans from school districts which were, at best, reluctant and, at worst, opposed to complying with the school desegregation requirements of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

These plans amounted to little more than "paper compliance". In almost every instance, they followed a "freedom of choice" format in which students or their parents were allowed to select the schools they wished to attend. With few exceptions, black children or their parents did not choose to attend schools which were formerly all-white, nor did white students elect to attend formerly black schools. Furthermore, when black students did attempt to attend white schools, widespread discrimination was evident in various phases of the desegregation process, such as class assignments, treatment of black students by white faculty and students, and degree of participation in extracurricular activities. Black parents and children often suffered economic reprisals and even physical brutality.[11]

Following adoption of these plans, much of Title IV's staff was again co-opted by Title VI to secure "assurances of compliance", which incorporated requirements of HEW's Title VI desegregation guidelines. During the summer of 1966, both Title VI and Title IV staff made visits to school districts throughout Southern and border States in an effort to help them meet applicable provisions of the Title VI guidelines.

Despite the emphasis on Title VI enforcement and the diversion of Title IV staff to Title VI activities during the first 2 years following passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, a number of programs were funded under Title IV auspices in Fiscal Years 1965 and 1966. (See Tables A, B1, B2, C2, and D1.) In most cases, however, these grants were made without much regard to the substance or quality of the grant application. As one staff member in Title IV phrased it: "We would support anything if they would agree to say something about integration and desegregation." [12]

By Spring 1967, individual senior staff members associated with the Title IV program began to urge a new direction for it and to recommend that it be separated from Title VI enforcement. For example, the Director of the Grants and Institutes Branch for Title IV recommended that all compliance activities be removed from assistance operations and that Title IV function as an independent unit in the Office of the Commissioner of Education.[13] In November 1967, a realignment occurred in part conforming to his suggestions and a Division of Equal Educational Opportunities was established to carry out the provisions of Title IV. However, instead of locating the Title IV unit in the Office of the Commissioner, it was lodged within a subordinate bureau of the Office of Education.[14]

Since the separation of the Title IV program from Title VI, the role played by Title IV in school desegregation has grown increasingly important. First, the dollar amount of grants which have been approved under Title IV has increased, from $4.6 million in 1965 to an estimated $19 million in 1971. Second, Title IV's staff, freed from other responsibilities, has been in a position to give full-time to Title IV implementation, and, thus, to devote more attention to the substance and quality of individual proposals. Finally, Title IV's importance, through its function of assisting in the development of desegregation plans, has increased as a result of the growing emphasis on achieving school desegregation through voluntary means and technical assistance rather than through fund cutoff under Title VI.

Emphasis of Title IV: Education v. Desegregation

In general, civil rights staff in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare have agreed that Title IV grants should support Title VI enforcement efforts by providing a carrot of Title IV money to complement the stick of Title VI enforcement. How best to utilize Title IV grants for this purpose, however, has been the subject of continuing disagreement.

From the beginning of the program, some officials have argued that local Title IV programs should focus on educational problems which may become visible in

[11] *Southern School Desegregation: 1966-67*, Finding No. 6(b), at 88; also 47. See also Testimony of Harold Howe II, United States Commissioner of Education, Hearing Before the Special Subcommittee on Civil Rights of the House Committee on the Judiciary, 89th Cong. 2d Sess., ser. 23 at 24 (1966).

[12] Staff interview with Dr. William Holloway, Evaluation Branch Chief, May 5, 1970.

[13] Memorandum from W. Stanley Kruger, Director, Grants and Institutes Branch, EEOP to David S. Seeley, Assistant Commissioner, Equal Educational Opportunities Program, May 17, 1967. Mr. Kruger felt that the basic functions of this office should include: a) management of grant and institution projects and related activities under Section 404 and 405 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964; b) the provision of technical assistance authorized by Section 403 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964; c) the operation of a clearinghouse of materials and information pertinent to problems of school integration and the solution of these problems, and d) the coordination of activities of major programs of the Office of Education directed towards a focus on school integration as a major responsibility of the Office of Education.

In addition to the grants made to local school systems, the memorandum recommended that assistance to school districts include analysis of school desegregation problems, development of plans to eliminate dual school system structures, and help with implementation of educational programs designed to secure equal educational opportunities.

[14] Since 1967 Title VI functions have been the responsibility of the Office for Civil Rights in the Office of the Secretary in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

[15] Dr. Marie Barry, Program Specialist, Title IV Central Office, May 1970.

the process of desegregation.[15] These officials believe that desegregation, coupled with high educational quality, will be more acceptable. In their view, desegregation will be easier to achieve if there is clear improvement in curriculum, teaching techniques, and in the training of teachers and other personnel to deal with poor achievers in desegregated schools.

For example, one senior official of the Office of Education, involved in Title IV programs from the beginning, told Commission staff: "I believe that the analysis of problems should begin with educational problems, individualized instruction, team teaching, and the like." [16]

This view was supported by a representative of a university where a desegregation center had been established who found that Title IV assistance was more readily accepted when the program focus was on educational techniques:

> School systems were shy at first in seeking assistance since they thought it was aimed at desegregation. But when they saw that the program was working to improve instruction, to resolve educational problems, to devise curriculum models to improve instruction, the support of superintendents was gained.[17]

Other staff members have contended that the emphasis should be on desegregation *per se* and that local programs funded under Title IV should help build understanding across lines and improve interpersonal relations. Title IV staff members criticized Title IV programs for de-emphasizing desegregation and human relations:

> The thrust should have been on human relations, with educational problems a distinct auxiliary concept, certainly not the main emphasis. Too much concentration on educational concepts obscured the need for change in behavior and interpersonal relationships necessary for a successful school program. An important educational program, without the ability by teachers and administrators to communicate, leaves a school system open to social, if not physical, confrontation.[18]

This sharp split among HEW and other officials as to the most effective approach for Title IV never has been entirely resolved.

The Commission's Study

In its examination of Title IV, the Commission has concentrated its investigation on the Southern and border States where the bulk of Title IV funds have gone.[19] The Commission also has investigated the operation of the program in New Mexico, where some program innovations have been undertaken which seemed to merit special consideration.

In examining the role of Title IV as a facilitator of the desegregation process, the Commission has looked at programs developed by individual school districts, training institutes and desegregation centers established in colleges and universities, and at Title IV units in State departments of education.[20]

Significance of Title IV

Although Title IV remains an ongoing Federal program, it has been superseded, to some extent, by the much larger Emergency School Assistance Program.[21] Its importance will diminish even more if the pending Emergency School Assistance and Quality Integrated Education Act is passed by Congress. Further, the proposed "Equal Educational Opportunities Act", if enacted, would turn the Federal Government's attention toward compensatory education efforts in segregated schools, further lessening the importance of Title IV.

Nevertheless, the Commission believes a detailed evaluation of the Title IV program can be of substantial value. The program has been in operation for approximately 8 years and there has been ample opportunity, through trial and error, to develop knowledge and understanding of the kinds of programs that can be most effective in the often difficult process of desegregation. In light of the current controversy, generated by the proposed "Student Transportation Moratorium Act" and the "Equal Educational Opportunities Act", which would accept the inevitabilty of school segregation, it is important to demonstrate that school desegregation is not an ideal incapable of achievement, but a reality that can work, even under the most difficult circumstances. It also is important to determine the kinds of help needed from the Federal Government.

The Commission issues this report with the conviction that the Nation can learn much that is constructive from the experience under Title IV—from its failures as well as from its successes—and that this knowledge will contribute to enriched understanding of the necessity for desegregation and stimulate a renewed effort to make it work.

---

[16] *Id.*

[17] Interview with Dean Joseph Hadley, School of Education, University of South Alabama, January 1970.

[18] Name withheld at request of staff member.

[19] Between 1965 and 1971, 54.3 percent of Title IV funds have gone to Southern and border States.

[20] See Tables A, C1, and D2 for list of university institutes, centers and State Title IV units visited by Commission staff.

[21] For an evaluation of the ESAP program during its first months of operation, see report of the Washington Research Project.

CHAPTER II

STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION

TITLE IV UNITS

Introduction

Under Section 403 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the U.S. Office of Education contracts with State departments of education to provide them with funds to enable the State departments to render technical assistance to school districts.[1] The purpose of technical assistance is to develop plans for desegregation and to assist with educational problems occasioned by desegregation.[2]

States have established special Title IV technical assistance units in their departments of education to carry out their responsibilities under Section 403.

These Title IV units are potentially key factors in bringing about successful school desegregation. The Office of Education funds State educaton technical assistance units because the State's primary role in the desegregation of schools is crucial to the achievement of equal educational opportunities. This support strengthens State education agencies to provide leadership and assistance to local school districts in the process of desegregation. The units make it possible for the State education agency to coordinate its programs and services to aid desegregating school districts and to carry out the State agency's special requirements.[3]

The Office of Education requires that before it will enter into a contract with a State education department under Section 403, the latter must show its capacity and commitment to provide those services that are directly related to desegregation.[4] State departments of education must assist local school boards in the development, adoption, and implementation of acceptable desegregation plans. In addition, the grant proposal must set program objectives that will contribute to desegregation. The specific objectives required by the U.S. Office of Education are: dissemination of information to local education agencies regarding effective methods for resolving problems accompanying desegregation; assurance that related Federal and State education programs and functions are designed to facilitate desegregation; and provision of planning assistance to education personnel to enable them to cope with desegregation problems.[5] State Title IV units are permitted flexibility regarding the means used in achieving these minimum objectives.[6]

State Title IV units also have specific functions within the State departments of education. They are responsible for keeping State boards of education informed of the need for stronger desegregation policies and procedures.[7]

They are to participate on a regular basis in department activities concerned with achievement of equal educational opportunity, and in drafting and reviewing legislation affecting desegregation and equal edu-

---

[1] Section 403 authorizes the Office of Education, itself, to render such technical assistance. The Office of Education, however, has interpreted the statute as authorizing it to contract with State departments of education to act as agents of the Office of Education to provide such technical assistance. The State departments enter into cost reimbursement contracts with the U.S. Office of Education. See HEW, Opinion to the Office for Civil Rights Governing the Funding of Universities and State Departments of Education, Aug. 10, 1967.

[2] Section 403.

[3] U.S. Office of Education, Division of Equal Educational Opportunities, Administrative Guidelines, 5 (1968).

[4] U.S. Office of Education, Division of Equal Educational Opportunities, Program Resource Guide: The Role of State Departments of Education in Implementing the Letter and Spirit of Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 5 (1970).

[5] *Id.* at 2. The Office of Education's Division of Equal Educational Opportunities provides staff assistance to help State departments prepare their applications for Title IV funding.

[6] Among the activities suggested by the Office of Education for carrying out these objectives are the following:

1. Identifying and analyzing facts relevant to the instigation and accomplishment of desegregation.
2. Development of in-service training programs.
3. Development of information and materials.
4. Development of community support.
5. Preparing supportive proposals for Title IV.
6. Administrative and instructional reorganization to cope with desegregation.
7. Development of long-range educational policy and planning in relation to the desegregation of schools and to education for a multicultural society.
8. Dealing with the problems of desegregation.
9. Coordination with other Federal programs and assistance in effective use of funds from such programs to advance desegregation and equal educational opportunity.
10. Providing immediate assistance to school districts which are faced with sudden and serious local problems.

Program Resource Guide, *supra* note 4.

[7] Among the activities suggested by the Office of Education, Division of Equal Educational Opportunities, Policies and Procedures Manual for Technical Assistance Programs Based at State Colleges or Universities.

cational opportunity.[8] Further, these units ought to be involved in Federal and State educational programs that develop policy relating to desegregation.[9] To carry out these responsibilities, State Title IV units should be placed high in the State department hierarchy if they are to function effectively.[10]

State Title IV technical assistance units have been in operation since 1965. The first unit was funded in Tennessee. Since the inception of the program, nine of the 11 Southern States and Oklahoma have been funded.[11] The contracts have ranged from $225,000 allocated to the State of Florida in 1965 to $17,592 given to the State of Mississippi in 1968.[12] The average contract has been $50,000 annually.

Performance

HEW Evaluation

According to a 1966 Office of Education evaluation report, State Title IV units had been of limited value. The report found they had been helpful in processing nondiscrimination assurance forms and statistical reports and had accompanied Title VI staff on field visits. Title IV units also provided the Office of Education with information about particular school systems, and had served as "catalysts" during negotiations with recalcitrant school districts.[13] They provided no technical assistance and little informational assistance to school districts in meeting problems incident to desegregation. The main value of State Title IV units during those early years of operation, according to the report, was as a source of information for HEW on the compliance status of school districts.[14]

By 1970 the situation had not appreciably changed. One HEW Title IV Administrator said of the current activities of the State Title IV units:

> The advantages of the State Department's grantees are: We occasionally get "intelligence" type information; we are given information in the regular course of their activities; the information we need is made available more quickly; and the State grantee can even open some doors.[15] He concluded: "It is better to have a guy there, even if he does not do anything." [16]

In fact, HEW does not conduct regular and systematic reviews of State Title IV units to determine how effectively they are performing. Evaluations of State Title IV units have been conducted on an *ad hoc* basis, in response to specific problems. Continuing contact with State Title IV units is not maintained by HEW either on a regional or a national basis. Therefore, HEW is not in a position to determine, without instituting a special evaluation, how effectively State Title IV units are using its funds.

Lack of staff is a major reason for HEW's failure to institute a regular monitoring program. As one HEW Title IV official told Commission staff:

> If you heard about something special or something went wrong you went [to investigate]. Otherwise you didn't go out. There was no specific monitoring program, but it was not because of any plan not to monitor. There were just not enough personnel.[17]

State Reports

State Title IV units are required to submit monthly technical assistance statistical reports and quarterly reports concerning their activities. These reports provide information on the number of desegregation plans developed, the number of requests for technical assistance received, and the number of school districts with which the State Title IV unit has worked.

They do not provide a sufficient basis for evaluating the performance of State Title IV units. The technical assistance reports give no information on the kind of assistance given to school districts, the nature of the program adopted, or the impact resulting from the assistance. The quarterly activities reports, while they give information on the activities of State Title IV staff, provide little basis for determining the extent of effort involved, the quality of assistance rendered, or the substantive results. For example, the Tennessee Title IV unit reported the following activities during the 8-month period from November 1, 1967 through June 30, 1968:

1. Consultation with Chairman of Education Department, University of Tennessee at Martin.
2. Meeting with Title IV Director in Chester County.
3. Knoxville team visit.

---

[8] Among the activities suggested by the Office of Education, Division of Equal Educational Opportunities, Policies and Procedures Manual for Technical Assistance Programs Based at Colleges or Universities.

[9] Program Resource Guide, *supra* note 4.

[10] *Id.* at Part III, 1.

[11] See Table A.

[12] See Table A.

[13] Report by Mrs. Sherry Arnstein, Self Evaluation of Title IV (EEOP), at 24 (1966).

[14] *Ibid.*

[15] Interview with Dr. Gregory Anrig, Former Director, Division of Equal Educational Opportunities. On those occasions when HEW's central or regional office staff is planning to visit a particular school district, contact is made with the State Title IV unit to secure information.

[16] *Id.*

[17] Interview with Miss Edna Ellicott, former staff member Title IV, Nov. 12, 1970.

4. Nashville Federal court trial involving teachers' dismissals.
5. Clarksville Annual TEA, Leadership Conference.[18]

A report from the Mississippi State Title IV unit on its activities during the month of January 1970 amounted to less than one full typewritten page. It consisted of a reference to the three major activities of the unit: working with superintendents of the 30 school districts under court order which made the transition to unitary systems by December 31, 1969; collecting data on school environments in the 30 districts; and meeting with members of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.[19]

Commission Staff Investigation

Commission staff interviews with State Title IV directors in the Spring of 1970 revealed little in the way of specific activities directed toward facilitating school desegregation.

Of the two major responsibilities of State Title IV units—assisting individual school districts in meeting problems occasioned by desegregation and assisting local school boards in the development, adoption, and implementation of acceptable desegregation plans—few of the eight State Title IV grant recipients had undertaken significant activity with respect to either. Four of the eight State unit directors in Oklahoma, North Carolina, Tennessee, and Texas stated they had conducted in-service workshops for school personnel and had held conferences with superintendents, teachers, and students. Only two of these directors, one in North Carolina and the other in Oklahoma, could provide detailed information concerning such activities as the number of workshops held, the specific information imparted at them, and the impact the workshops and conferences had made on their participants.[20]

The most significant in-service workshop activities have been carried out by the Oklahoma Title IV unit. It held four workshops for guidance counselors during 1970, one in each corner of the State, in an effort to improve educational opportunities for minority students.[21] The approach used was to utilize counselors as active participants on panels to exchange information on the methods used in the various school systems.[22] In addition, as of July 1970, the Oklahoma State Title IV unit was planning an ambitious in-service training program for teachers in eight medium-sized cities in the State.[23]

Regarding the second specific contractual obligation of State Title IV units to assist local school boards in the development, adoption, and implementation of acceptable school desegregation plans, there is little evidence of any significant activity. Most State Title IV directors conceded that they had not participated in the development of many desegregation plans. They expressed the belief that plan development was the responsibility of individual school districts, not theirs.[24]

That State Title IV units have avoided participating in the development of desegregation plans is, at least in part, because of the political pressures to which they are subject in the State and local community. For example, the coordinator of the Georgia State Title IV unit told Commission staff that he had been advised by the State attorney general not to prepare desegregation plans.[25] Early in 1970, Claude Kirk, then Governor of

---

[18] Tennessee State Department of Education, Title IV Office, Technical Progress Report, Nov. 1, 1967–June 30, 1968.

[19] Mississippi State Department of Education, Title IV Office, Resume of Activities for the month of January 1970 submitted to the Office of Education, February 1970. There is some question about how much value, if any, HEW places on these reports or whether HEW personnel actually review them. For example, Commission staff, in trying to secure copies of State Title IV unit interim reports, were told by HEW Title IV officials in Washington that these reports were sent to the regional offices. Commission staff requests to the regional office elicited this response: "If we have them I don't know where they are. . . . Maybe the central office has them." Interviews with Tom Kendrick, Senior Program Officer, HEW Regional Office, Dallas, Tex., Aug. 20, 1970. Four special requests had to be made of HEW's Atlanta Regional Office before State IV Unit interim reports were made available.

[20] Interviews with State Title IV directors of Oklahoma, North Carolina, Tennessee, and Texas. The North Carolina Title IV unit held a 3-day workshop in 1970 for assistant superintendents in an effort to help them recognize their role in assuring that black teachers and other school personnel were adequately represented in the school system. North Carolina also held human relations workshops for teachers and is currently trying to establish student human relations councils in every high school. Further, a workshop concerning the role of superintendents in desegregation was held in Wil[illegible]ton, N.C. in July 1970. Interviews with Robert Strother, Director, Title IV Office, North Carolina State Department of Education, Raleigh, N.C., March 1970.

[21] Interview with Dr. Charles Sandman, former Director, Title IV Unit, Oklahoma State Department of Education, Oklahoma City, Okla., February 1970.

[22] *Id.*

[23] *Id.*

[24] Interviews with directors of the Georgia, South Carolina, Oklahoma, Tennessee, and North Carolina State Title IV units. The contract which the State department of education signs with the Division of Equal Educational Opportunities to receive assistance specifically outlines those functions which the units are to perform. One of the specific functions is to assist local education agencies in the development, adoption, and implementation of an acceptable desegregation plan. The Title IV State department units are not the only Title IV office charged with the responsibility for writing plans. The HEW Title IV Regional Offices and the university-based desegregation centers also assist in the writing of desegregation plans. The Title IV State units' responsibility comes into play when the units are requested by a school district to assist it in writing a plan or when the O.E., DEEO, central office requests the unit to contact a school district about the drawing up of an acceptable plan. In the latter instance, the units are expected not only to contact the district but also to assist it in the development of a plan. The local school district is not required to accept the Title IV unit's plan. But if this is the case, the school district must then develop is own plan which must be acceptable to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

[25] Interview with W. M. Harry, Coordinator, Title IV Program, Georgia State Department of Education, Atlanta, Ga., Feb. 24, 1970.

Florida, personally intervened in an effort to prevent desegregation in his State.

Many State Title IV officials feel that their participation in the preparation of school desegregation plans undermines their ability to work effectively with local educators. The State Title IV coordinator in South Carolina explained that, in his opinion, requiring State Title IV directors to prepare desegregation plans tends to place them in the class of "crusaders" and thereby interferes with their relationships with school superintendents.[26] He added: "Let the blame fall on HEW Title IV people rather than myself, so as not to impair my usefulness."[27]

Regardless of the validity of the reasons why State Title IV unit directors have avoided involvement in desegregation plan development, their obligation to do so is a contractual one. Further, the need for participation of these units in the development of such plans has increased in recent years because of the growing trend of the courts to order immediate desegregation which requires preparation of a substantial number of desegregation plans.

Effectiveness

Because of the many forces that bear on school desegregation, the effectiveness of State Title IV units cannot be measured by reference to the degree of progress in school desegregation in a given State. Court decisions, HEW Title VI enforcement, the activities of university-based desegregation centers all have contributed, so that it is impossible to attribute successful desegregation solely to the work of the State Title IV unit. One measure of the effectiveness of the State Title IV units is the impact they have had on people with whom they work. Using this measure, it does not appear that State Title IV units have contributed significantly to progress in school desegregation.

Of the teachers, principals, and superintendents interviewed by Commission staff, only a handful made any reference to the work State Title IV units and then only in response to specific staff questions concerning their activities. One Florida school official told a Commission staff member:

> There has been no real contact with the State Title IV Office. Most of the assistance was received from the University of Miami [Desegregation Center].

An official of the Shelby County, Tennessee school system said bluntly: "There was no input from the State."[28] In fact, school officials in most districts visited by Commission staff were even unaware of the existence of a State Title IV Office.

Personnel at university-based desegregation centers comprise another group with whom State Title IV units are supposed to work. In view of the fact that State Title IV units and centers are charged with the same responsibilities, program coordination is essential to the effective operation of both. But despite occasional examples of this coordination,[29] there is no evidence that it has been done on a consistent or systematic basis. On the contrary, State Title IV unit directors and center directors alike, concede that their programs have overlapped and have even conflicted because of a lack of coordination.[30]

There is evidence of distrust and hostility between staff of the State Title IV units and university desegregation centers. A Title IV unit director criticized a university desegregation center as trying to do too much in too short a time in an attempt to change attitudes.[31] He added: "I don't know what they are doing, and they don't either." By the same token, an official of the same university desegregation center complained of the State Title IV director: "He is around here all the time."[32] In another State a Title IV coordinator, describing the relationship between the university desegregation center and his State Title IV unit, told Commission staff:

> There is a feeling at the University which is communicated to the State Department that the State Department does not know what it is doing. I think the way we are getting sidetracked is that the University personnel tend to give us all a particular name—"bigots."[33]

In short, university desegregation centers and State Title IV units, rather than working in harmony and close cooperation toward the goal of school desegregation, frequently conduct their activities in isolation

[26] Interview with J. C. Durham, Title IV Coordinator, Technical Assistance Unit, South Carolina State Department of Education, Columbia, S.C., Mar. 3, 1970.

[27] *Id.*

[28] Interview with Cornell Wells, Coordinating Administrator, Shelby County School System, Memphis, Tenn., Feb. 20, 1970.

[29] For example, the Oklahoma State Title IV Unit worked with the Desegregation Center at Norman, Okla. on a 2-week teachers' workshop during the summer of 1970. Interview with Van Wright, Human Relations Center, State Department of Education, Oklahoma City, Okla.

[30] See, e.g., Interview with Robert Strother, Equal Education Opportunities Program, Title IV, Department of Public Instruction, Raleigh, N.C. and interview with Robert Sharpe, Director, Equal Education Opportunities Program, State Department of Education, Nashville, Tenn.

[31] Interview with Gilbert Conoly, Director, Title IV unit in the Office of the Commissioner of Education, Texas State Board of Education, Texas Education Agency, Austin, Tex., Feb. 12, 1970.

[32] Interview with Leon Cashaw, Texas Educational Desegregation Technical and Advisory Center, Division of Extension, Office of Extension Teaching and Field Service Bureau, Austin, Tex., Feb. 11, 1970.

[33] Interview with J. C. Durham, *supra* note 26.

from one another. They are distrustful of each other's programs and methods of operation and one is largely ignorant of what the other is doing. As the Director of a State Title IV unit concluded: "There is no coordination of programs between the Center and State Title IV."[34]

State Title IV units are to work with other units in the State departments of education and potentially can have the effect of promoting State policies that further school desegregation. Few of the State Title IV units, however, can point to specific activities they have engaged in with other education department personnel. In response to questions from Commission staff most State Title IV officials were vague regarding the nature of their work with other units in the department. For example, the North Carolina Title IV director could report only that his staff works with the guidance and curriculum units and is on "liberty" call for service to all other units in the State department.[35] Of the eight State Title IV units evaluated by Commission staff, only those in Oklahoma and South Carolina provided specific information on programs jointly carried out with other units of the State department. The South Carolina Title IV unit director explained to Commission staff his view of the role the State Title IV unit must play in relation to the rest of the State department of education:

> Every aspect of the department must focus on the problems which come from the elimination of the dual school system. . . . The teamwork approach should be taken to alleviate the problems brought about by the elimination of the dual school system.[36]

Thus, he has worked with units in the State department responsible for the administration of funds under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, with State department officials concerned with ungraded classes and with developing new learning materials, and with those concerned with education research.[37]

The Oklahoma Title IV unit has set up a curriculum committee comprised of representatives of the Title IV unit and of the State department's curriculum division. One of the continuing projects of this committee is concerned with developing materials on the history of the Plains Indians. Another is developing materials on Black History in Oklahoma.[38]

[34] Interview with Robert Sharpe, *supra* note 30.
[35] Interview with Robert Strother, *supra* note 30.
[36] Interview with J. C. Durham, *supra* note 26.
[37] *Ibid.*
[38] Interview with Van Wright, Human Relations Center, State Department of Education, Oklahoma City, Okla.

Reasons for Ineffectiveness

In most cases, the State Title IV units have little contact with other State department of education offices and little influence on department policy.

There are a number of reasons why the full potential of State Title IV units has not been realized as a significant factor in facilitating school desegregation. The funds provided to State Title IV units are insufficient to permit them to undertake aggressive programs. For example, the Florida Title IV director told Commission staff:

> We do not have the wherewithal to develop plans, as well as conduct in-service training programs for the various counties.[39]

These are the responsibilities that the Title IV units are contractually obligated to perform. Nearly all of the funds provided to State Title IV units are used to pay personnel salaries. In attempting to carry on such activities as in-service training workshops, State Title IV units have had difficulty finding funds to meet such expenses as stipends for teachers' travel expenses, consultant fees, and the purchase of instructional materials. Funds to finance Oklahoma's planned in-service training program in eight medium-sized cities will not come from the State Title IV budget, but from a supplemental HEW grant.[40]

Some States have strengthened Title IV units by adding their own funds to the program to supplement those provided under contract with the Office of Education. In 1970, the Oklahoma and North Carolina State Title IV units received $3,125 and $34,720, respectively, from their State departments of education, to assist in meeting the cost of operating their units.

State Title IV units have been in addition, hampered in the fact that they occupy relatively low positions in the hierarchy of the State department of education. For example, the Georgia Title IV director is three steps removed from direct contact with the State superintendent of schools.

In addition, State IV unit personnel have only infrequent contact with the State superintendent and are unable to exert a major influence on department decisions. In Oklahoma, the State Title IV director told Commission staff that he worked directly under the State superintendent's office and reported directly to him. Asked how often he met with the superintendent,

[39] Interview with Don Cunningham, Director, Technical Assistance Program, Florida State Department of Education, Tallahassee, Florida.
[40] Interview with Dr. Charles Sandman, Director, State Title IV Unit, February 1970.

however, the director could only reply: "Whenever the need arises." [41] The response of the Tennessee Title IV director to the same question was, "As needed."[42] In most cases, there is no evidence of regular contact between the State Title IV office and the State superintendent nor is information provided on what is accomplished on those occasions when meetings do occur.

North Carolina appears to be an exception. The director of the Title IV unit is considered by the State department of education as a member of the executive staff. He meets with the superintendent at least twice a week to discuss his programs and problems and he is included in all meetings where department of education policy is determined. In other States, Title IV units are far removed from the centers of policy and decisionmaking.

In many of the Southern States in which Title IV units have been established, it has been official State policy to resist school desegregation. This has restricted the efforts of Title IV unit personnel who, despite their contractual obligation in the matter, often believe that their first allegiance is to further the policies of the State department of education. In Mississippi, where the State department of education has openly resisted school desegregation, the State Title IV director's commitment to desegregation was considered so uncertain that HEW officials operating in Mississippi during the Spring and Summer of 1969 did not even ask for his assistance.[43]

A former director of the HEW Title IV Program expressed the view that in at least two States the problem was so severe that the State program should be discontinued.[44]

In some States, despite a political climate opposed to desegregation, Title IV officials have persisted in good faith in bringing about desegregation. In Florida, where in 1970 the Governor actively intervened to prevent desegregation, the State Title IV unit continued its work of preparing desegregation plans for a number of counties in the State. The Florida Title IV director told Commission staff:

> Our position is that regardless of the statement in the public press by the Governor and other politicians, we tell people at the local level that the [unit's] policy is remaining the same until we have received an official statement in writing to the contrary.[45]

The directors of the Title IV units evaluated in this report are white southerners with previous experience as teachers, principals, or superintendents in Southern school systems. The majority of these staffs also consist of southerners who previously worked in Southern school systems. Of the 21 State Title IV professional staff members in the eight States, only six are black and one is a Mexican American.

Most of the directors of these units are products of segregated school systems and have gained their professional experience working in school districts that had not desegregated at the time they were employed.[46] On the basis of the educational and professional background of State Title IV unit personnel, there is reason to question whether these officials possess sufficient knowledge or sensitivity concerning desegregation problems to provide the kind of assistance school districts need to accomplish successful desegregation. In addition, in view of the fact that Title IV units are composed of indigenous personnel, many of whom may have political ties to the State, there is a strong likelihood that their first loyalty is to State and not to Federal policy.

One potential advantage in selecting white southerners to staff Title IV units in Southern States lies in the hope that these are people acquainted with the area and with the school personnel with whom they must work. They could be in a better position to stimulate

---

[41] Interview with Van Wright, *supra* note 38.

[42] Interview with Robert Sharpe, *supra* note 30.

[43] "The Georgia and Mississippi State Department Title IV Units should be closed because of loyalties of the directors." Interview with Dr. Gregory Anrig, *supra* note 15.

[44] *Id.*

[45] Interview with Don Cunningham, *supra* note 39. The Title IV Unit prepared plans for Hamilton and St. John Counties and assisted in the development of desegregation plans for Leon County, St. Lucie County, and Palm Beach County.

[46] J. C. Durham, Director, Title IV Unit, South Carolina State Department of Education is a native of Pickens, S.C., the area with the lowest ratio of blacks in the State. Mr. Durham attended segregated schools and before coming to Title IV, was a superintendent in Pickens which was not desegregated at the time he left, and is still not desegregated.

Dr. Charles Sandman, past-Director, Title IV, Oklahoma State Department of Education, previously worked in the guidance section of the State department of education. He has a B.S. Degree from East Central College in Oklahoma, and a M.E. and Ed.D. from Oklahoma University. He explains his multicultural experience as working with integrated schools while in Guidance.

Van Wright, Director, Title IV Unit, Oklahoma State Department of Education, has been a superintendent in Reed, Greenfield, and Cheyenne, Okla. Neither Reed nor Cheyenne had a minority population in their schools. Mr. Wright received his bachelor's degree from Southwestern State College and his master's from West Texas State University.

Robert Sharpe, Director, Title IV Unit, Tennessee State Department of Education, was an English Professor at Louisiana State University, the University of Tennessee, and Vanderbilt University. Mr. Sharpe stated that he had had no multicultural experience other than teaching.

W. M. Harry, Coordinator of Federal Programs, Georgia State Department of Education, has held other positions in the State department of education as Coordinator of Title III, NDEA, and counselor in the Vocational Rehabilitation Division. He was a superintendent in a school system which was not desegregated.

The information given above was compiled from the interviews with the respective directors and the Secretary to the Director of the Georgia Title IV Unit.

successful desegregation than outsiders unfamiliar with the area and unknown and distrusted by the local community. This potential advantage, however, has proved to be an illusion. The director of the South Carolina State Title IV unit told Commission staff that, although he previously had been a superintendent in his State, he now found that other superintendents would not ask him for help.[47] The Oklahoma State Title IV director stated that, although he had worked with superintendents in his State in his previous capacity as guidance counselor, he was now unable to break down the "I have no problems" attitude of his colleagues.[48] He had assumed that his past friendships with school superintendents would provide him with an opportunity to work effectively for school desegregation but this had not occurred. The superintendents gave him no support and they would not "let him try anything." [49]

Perhaps the relative ineffectiveness of State Title IV units has been caused by their failure to assume a leadership role. In most cases, their posture has been one of timidity and reluctance to disturb the *status quo*. For example, the Title IV coordinator in Georgia expressed the view to Commission staff that: "The Title IV office is not obligated to tell districts whether they should obey Federal or State laws where they conflict." He added: "The Title IV office is interested in quality education for all." [50] In Oklahoma, where a State antibusing law had been enacted, the Title IV director told Commission staff: "This takes care of our busing problem." [51] In Mississippi, which has 106 school districts, the director of the State Title IV unit advised the Commission representatives that a staff of two [he and his secretary] were adequate to handle the functions of his unit.[52]

Title IV personnel have also expressed views insensitive or unsympathetic to school desegregation. Thus, the Georgia Title IV coordinator said of the discredited "Freedom of Choice" desegregation plans: "Freedom of choice is democratic, right and moral." [53]

Some Title IV units have managed to close their eyes to the existence of problems incident to school desegregation. Despite numerous investigations concerning his State and other States in the South which documented large scale displacement of black teachers and principals in Georgia during the course of desegregation, the Georgia State Title IV director told Commission staff:

> [T]hey haven't run into it [displacement of educators] much. . . .
>
> [T]hey haven't had this too much in Georgia.[54]

According to a 1966 Office of Education evaluation of State Title IV units, not only had they failed to assume the leadership role intended for them, but some had openly subverted the efforts of the Title IV program.[55] While this charge may be unduly harsh, the Commission's recent investigations indicate that it is, in large part, still warranted.

State Title IV units have lacked sufficient status within their departments to affect desegregation-related policy. They have been timid in their efforts to support desegregation and are opposed to becoming involved in developing actual plans for it. Their role continues to reflect lack of coordination with other units of their department or with other institutions in their State involved in Title IV programs. In short, Commission investigations have found underfunded, uncommitted, and ineffective State department units of Title IV.

A wide range of causes on both the State and Federal levels is responsible for this lack of success.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the U.S. Office of Education have not insisted that State departments adhere to the "Program Resource Guide: the Role of State Department of Education in Implementing the Letter and Spirit of Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964." Both HEW and the Office of Education lack sufficient staff to carry out regular and systematic reviews of the effectiveness of the State Title IV units. Finally, the quarterly reports submitted by these units do not provide an adequate basis for comprehensively evaluating their programs.

While the situation varies from State to State, and although not all the problems in the following list apply to any one State, the State education department Title IV units have been hampered or made ineffective by adverse situations. Sometimes these are beyond their control; sometimes they are self-willed.

The great weakness of most State Title IV units has been found in their inability or unwillingness to assume an appropriate leadership role in assisting school systems in planning and implementing desegregation. In some cases this has been due to a lack of under-

[47] Interview with J. C. Durahm, *supra* note 26.

[48] Interview with Charles Sandman, *supra* note 40.

[49] Interview with W. M. Harry, *supra* note 25.

[50] *Id.*

[51] Interview with Van Wright, *supra* note 29.

[52] Interview with John Ethridge, Director, Title IV Unit, Mississippi State Department of Education, December 1969.

[53] Interview with W. M. Harry, *supra* note 25. Freedom of choice is a mechanism utilized in an interim desegregation plan which permits a parent or student to choose the school the student will attend in the following year. Under freedom-of-choice plans there is usually very little desegregation. These plans have been largely abandoned since they do not meet current standards for desegregation.

[54] Interview with W. M. Harry, *supra* note 25.

[55] OE report, *supra* note 13 at 24.

standing of what is expected of them; in others, there has been lack of commitment and even hostility to the idea.

In some States, political pressure—including the intervention of the Governor or the attorney general—has made their situation difficult but not always untenable.

Generally, State Title IV units have not enjoyed a high position in the hierarchy of State departments of education. Their directors seldom have direct access to the State superintendent and the units have little relationship with others within their department. Staff is seldom of sufficient size to carry out contractual obligations while insufficient funding is the rule not the exception.

In some States there is distrust and even hostility between the State Title IV unit staff and the staff of the university desegregation center.

In most States, the majority, if not all the professional staff, had previously worked for the State department of education in some other unit. They are, for the most part, indigenous, educated in segregated public schools, and are the products of segregated colleges, universities, and graduate schools. This is as true of those State Title IV units which have functioned well as for those which have functioned poorly.

CHAPTER III

LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES

Introduction

It is at the local level that the demands of social change are ultimately met. This holds true for desegregation as well as any other social change. Establishing national policy is crucial; State assistance (or acquiescence) is of great importance; but "the buck stops" on the conference table of the local school board and the desk of its superintendent. Experience clearly shows that where local school authorities have provided leadership, the desegregation process has moved more smoothly bringing better educational results and less community disruption.

Section 405 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 authorizes grants to local school systems for two purposes: in-service training programs for teachers and other school personnel which will aid them in dealing with problems incident to desegregation and for the employment of specialists to advise local districts on desegregation.[1]

From 1965 to the end of fiscal year 1971, a total of 510 grants was awarded to 534 school systems throughout the Nation. About 70 percent of the grants went to districts in the 17 Southern and border States. The total expenditure for these grants was nearly $26.5 million during the 7-year period. The average grant was about $50,000. There have been a few grants of more than $100,000, made to very large school districts, and some grants of less than $10,000, awarded to small rural districts.[2]

There were few applications for Section 405 funds during the first year of Title IV's life; indeed, only 24 grants were made. The unwillingness of school districts to undertake any but the most minimal steps toward desegregation accounted for the early lack of interest in Title IV funds. Hence, few sought or would even accept the assistance available from a Title IV grant.

As Title VI enforcement was accelerated, however, interest in Title IV assistance also grew. In 1971, a total of 139 grants—nearly six times the number awarded in 1965—was made to local districts. About two-thirds of the 1971 grants went to districts in the Southern or border States.

Objective of Local Grants

There never has been a clear and unambiguous statement setting forth the goals or objectives to be met by Section 405 grants, the specific problems to be solved, or the type of programs suitable for funding. To the extent that these issues have been dealt with at all, they have been discussed in general rather than specific terms. Thus the Civil Rights Legislation Planning Group, established in 1963 to make recommendations to the Commissioner of Education regarding implementation of Title IV, said relatively little of a specific nature about the local grant program.

The report did urge that funds be used to support projects which could serve as "prototypes" for "the testing of hypotheses and the demonstration of techniques pertinent to the entire [Title IV] program."[3] "The idea of the prototype or model project," the report further stated, "is not that the program should be limited to a few favored communities, but . . . that the limited funds not be so thinly disbursed that no community is in a position to make a significant contribution to the technology of educational civil rights administration."[4] The report also recommended that local projects be directly related to matters having a civil rights base, be supported by persons of influence in school affairs, and be part of a total program to improve equal educational opportunity in the school system.[5]

The Policies and Procedures Manual developed for Title IV grants to local school boards also offers little guidance in implementing Section 405. While the *Manual* states unequivocally that: "The primary mission of the program is to focus available Title IV resources on permanent elimination of school desegregation,"[6] it leaves open the question of mechanisms for implementation. "No one program approach," it states, "has

[1] Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title IV, Section 405.

[2] See Table B-1-4 for a State-by-State summary of Section 405 grants.

[3] Civil Rights Legislation Planning Group Report (1963), at p. 11.

[4] *Id.* at p. 29.

[5] *Ibid.*

[6] *Policies and Procedures Manual for Grants to School Boards.* Division of Equal Educational Opportunities, Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education, Office of Education, Revised, October 1969, p. 2.

been found suitable for the wide variety of problems which may confront school systems." [7]

The lack of specific HEW guidelines concerning goals and objectives for the Local Educational Agency (LEA) program has resulted in a lack of consistency in the type of professionals that were approved. Former Title IV officials told Commission staff that decisions on funding particular LEA programs frequently were made on the basis of the views of the individual Title IV staff member involved, rather than established criteria of uniform applicability.[8] The lack of specific criteria also led to the funding of programs totally unrelated to desegregation. Despite the language of Title IV limiting LEA grants to programs concerned with "problems incident to desegregation," proposals oriented entirely to educational matters such as team teaching and compensatory education frequently were approved.[9]

Local Educational Agency Grant Funding

Typically, the local Title IV program begins during the year prior to a major desegregation effort but at a time when the local school system is aware that such an effort will be made. Frequently, the program has been instituted when the district has decided, whether on its own volition, under court order, or through urging from HEW, that it must change from a freedom-of-choice desegregation plan [10] to one which involves rezoning of school boundary lines and/or of Federal financial assistance.[11] The threat of fund cutoff was avoided when McComb, Mississippi secured a court-ordered desegregation plan which was less stringent than the one sought by the Federal Agency.[12]

Because of the limited resources available for Title IV, the funding of school districts not committed to desegregation results both in a waste of money and in an inability to fund proposals from districts that are making successful efforts to desegregate. For instance, at the time the Tupelo and McComb, Mississippi proposals were funded, HEW declined to award a second Title IV grant to the New Albany, Mississippi School District which had just successfully desegregated its elementary schools with the aid of a Section 405 program and was requesting assistance to desegregate its secondary schools.[13]

Participation In Local Title IV Programs

School Personnel

Participation in training under local Title IV programs is limited by statute to "teachers and other school personnel." The typical local training program has focused exclusively on teachers and has involved a 2- or 3-week seminar or workshop held prior to the opening of school, followed by periodic sessions during the school year.

The guidelines for Section 405 grants specifically state that the statutory term "school personnel" may include a wide variety of school system employees, such as "teachers, administrators, school board members, counselors, health workers, clerical and maintenance staffs, etc." [14] Nevertheless, although the Commission found some training programs which included principals, counselors, and other school professional personnel in the sessions, in most districts programs were largely directed only toward teachers.

Community Representation

The Commission did find a few districts which included parents, students, and community leaders in their training programs as observers or consultants. In these districts, broad participation by representatives of the community helped create a climate of opinion conducive to successful desegregation. One such district was Muskogee, Oklahoma, where a panel of community leaders participated in a workshop in which they shared with teachers their views on a wide range of civil rights issues, including open housing, the impact of the news media on desegregation, fair employment, and the economic values of desegregation. The quarterly technical progress report made to the HEW Regional Office described the panel as follows:

> . . . these lay people were used as resource people. The most important understanding acquired by the teachers was that our leading lay citizens were truly interested in achieving complete deseg-

[7] *Ibid.*

[8] Interview with Dr. William Holloway and Richard Fairley, former Title IV staff members, May 1970.

[9] Interview with Richard Fairley, *supra* note 8.

[10] Freedom of choice is a mechanism utilized in an interim desegregation plan which permits a parent or student to choose the school the student will attend in the following school year. Under freedom-of-choice plans there is usually very little desegregation. These plans have been largely abandoned since they do not meet current standards for desegregation.

[11] A finding of noncompliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 results in an order of termination of Federal financial assistance to the school district.

[12] Tupelo also obtained a court ordered desegregation plan, thereby avoiding further negotiations with HEW.

[13] HEW staff explained the Department's decision not to make a second award to New Albany on the grounds that Section 405 grants are not made beyond 3 years and are not given to school systems which have completed desegregation. The 3-year limitation seems a strange justification inasmuch as the district had received only a single 1-year grant under Title IV. The claim that New Albany had already accomplished total desegregation was also inappropriate since the grant was intended to accompany secondary school desegregation. Interview with Elton Ridge, Chief, Southern Branch, DEEO, Mar. 31, 1970.

[14] *Policies and Procedures Manual for Grants to School Boards*, p. 1.

regation of the community as well as the schools. Too, the teachers acquired a great feeling of security in their efforts at resolving problems related to teaching in a desegregated school and to curriculum and techniques appropriate to the situation. . . .[15]

The Title IV coordinator in Muskogee also sought to obtain support for the system's desegregation plans from influential citizens and community groups. As a result, several of these groups made public statements supporting the desegregation plan.[16]

The Muskogee Title IV program also involved students and parents. Prior to the opening of school in 1968, about 100 student leaders in biracial sessions, supervised by teachers, worked out methods of electing cheerleaders in desegregated schools; election procedures for student council representatives, homeroom officers, and club officers to assure representation from both races; procedures for consolidating athletic teams and other extracurricular activities; and choosing of school colors. Student meetings under the Title IV program continued for 2 school years.

In addition to the student sessions, town hall-type meetings were held in which black and white parents, students, and teachers were encouraged to raise and frankly discuss any questions they might have about desegregation.

Efforts also were made in Muskogee to involve every type of district staff member in planning and implementing the desegregation process. For example, school librarians developed a publication which presented annotated information on library books, filmstrips, and other visual aids having multiracial and multiethnic content. Language arts and social studies teachers were organized into groups with responsibility for developing appropriate curriculum for the courses they taught. The result was new material on the achievements of blacks in literature and American History.

In addition, through the process of working together black and white teachers developed increasing rapport. Moreover, some teachers were given an opportunity to work in a summer school session with elementary school students, thereby gaining the benefit of actual interracial experience in a classroom situation prior to the opening of school. According to the Muskogee Title IV coordinator this was of substantial help in breaking down walls of hostility and fear among faculty and toward students.[17]

In Moore County, North Carolina, efforts also were made to gain community participation as a means of helping to facilitate desegregation. After having desegregated the elementary and junior high schools through the device of "pairing",[18] the county school board developed a plan to desegregate the high schools involving construction of a new high school to serve students attending the three existing schools.[19] In the Spring of 1969, school administrators held meetings in each of the three localities in the county that would be affected by the high school desegregation plan to be implemented the following September. Parents, community leaders and interested citizens were invited to attend these meetings to discuss their respective roles in making desegregation a success. School officials explained how the plan would work with student leaders of the schools to be desegregated. As a result of these efforts to assure that the community was informed and involved, according to the school superintendent, the schools were desegregated the following September without incident.[20]

In Brevard County, Florida, the school board established broad-based community committees which played an active leadership role in helping to facilitate successful desegregation. The committees, which included a local mayor, PTA members, several ministers, an NAACP official, two local doctors, and two aerospace industry employees, held a number of open meetings in black and white schools throughout the county explaining how the plan would work.

In the city of Melbourne, the committee, through a series of such meetings which received good press coverage, was able to gain community support for the desegregation plan. According to one local school official, the fact that community representatives rather than school officials explained the plan made the residents more receptive to it.[21] In his view the fact that

[15] Technical Progress Report, August, September, October 1969. Muskogee Public Schools, Muskogee, Okla.

[16] For example, the Muskogee Jaycees passed a resolution which stated: ". . . the Muskogee Jaycees commend and support the Superintendent of Schools and the Board of Education for their courageous efforts in adopting a program that not only satisfies the law but, takes a forward step for progressive education for the children of Muskogee." *Id.*

The Ministerial Alliance also supported the position of the school board: "Therefore, be it resolved that the Muskogee Ministerial Alliance commends the Muskogee School Board and the Superintendent of Schools for their efforts toward formulating a workable plan to bring about integration in the Muskogee City Schools at the earliest time feasible." *Id.*

[17] Interview with Whitt Abbott, Title IV Program Coordinator, Muskogee, Okla., Feb. 11, 1970.

[18] School desegregation by pairing is achieved when the attendance areas of two or more nearby schools are merged so that each school serves different grade levels for a new, larger attendance area. For example, the attendance zones of a predominantly black school, each serving grades 1–6, would be merged so that all children in grades 1–3 in the new attendance area would attend one school, and all children in grades 4–6 in the new attendance area would attend the other school.

[19] Interview with Robert E. Lee, Superintendent, Moore County Administrative Unit, N.C., Jan. 7, 1970.

[20] *Id.*

[21] Interview with Dr. Frank Williams, Director of Federal Projects, Brevard County School System, Brevard County, Fla., Apr. 1, 1970.

Melbourne voluntarily adopted and implemented a desegregation plan while the rest of the county awaited a court order was in large part a result of the efforts of these county committees.[22]

Speakers and Consultants

Speakers, consultants, and other persons who conduct local training programs have most often been drawn from three major sources—the nearest office of the United States Office of Education, the State department of education, and nearby university desegregation centers. Occasionally, speakers are invited from other school districts which have effected desegregation. According to several participants in local training programs who were interviewed by Commission staff, speakers, discussion leaders, and consultants have been predominantly, sometimes exclusively, white.[23] As one Title IV central office staff member said:

> Consultants, particularly in the early days of the program, were almost exclusively white with the exception of a few black college presidents. School systems which had always operated dual school systems simply had no notion of whom to contact to serve as consultants.[24]

The Title IV Coordinator

Title IV funds for advisory specialists usually have been used by local school districts to employ a coordinator for all Title IV activities, including training programs. Typically, these coordinators have come from within the school system.

Although most coordinators enjoy the formal status of reporting directly to the school superintendent, there is evidence that many lack prestige or influence in the school hierarchy. For example, in Charlottesville, Virginia, the Title IV coordinator, called upon to work with a biracial faculty committee, had no voice in the selection of participants. All were selected by the school principals.[25] Further, the office space assigned to the coordinator was a cubicle near the back door of a high school, far away from the center of school activities and at a distance from the elaborate offices of the school system's administrative staff.[26]

In another district, during the course of Commission staff interviews, the superintendent continuously called the Title IV coordinator by his first name although he gave courtesy titles to the white staff members in the room.[27] In still another district, the Title IV coordinator had so little contact with the superintendent that the latter did not recognize her as a school system employee. The coordinator's office was on the same floor as that of the superintendent and she had been employed by the school system for 20 years.[28]

In some instances, Title IV coordinators appear to represent apologists for the *status quo* rather than to be instruments for expeditious and successful school integration. In Charlottesville, Virginia, the Title IV coordinator contended in an interview with Commission staff that there were no integration problems in his school system.[29] Others, however, told Commission staff that serious problems existed,[30] and even the Charlottesville superintendent conceded that: "We have desegregation, but it will be a long time before we have integration." [31] In Chesapeake, Virginia, the Title IV coordinator, in response to Commission staff questions on progress in school integration, warned repeatedly: "We can't go too fast." [32]

Factors other than special competence appear to have intruded themselves in the selection process for Title IV coordinators. Race has been one such factor. Most local educational agency Title IV coordinators have been white. In some cases, however, there is evidence to suggest that the position of Title IV coordinator has provided a convenient source of employment for black principals and administrators who are displaced in the process of desegregation.

For example, in Florida a black principal accepted the Title IV coordinator's position, after having first

[22] *Id.*

[23] As one Title IV workshop participant said: "There were no black consultants in the Title IV program. Out of all the workshops I participated in, I cannot recall one black consultant. One white staff member answered me when asked why a black in the system was not used as a consultant: "Maybe you've been black too long [to understand]." William Dorsey, Public Relations Officer, Chattanooga City Schools, Chattanooga, Tenn., Feb. 10, 1970.

[24] Interview with Miss Edna Ellicott, former staff member of the Division of Equal Educational Opportunities, November 1970.

[25] Interview with Dr. E. W. Rushton, Superintendent, Charlottesville City Schools, March 1970.

[26] A Title IV staff member when visiting the program learned that Lane High School faculty thought the Title IV coordinator was a member of the high school faculty and was unaware of his role in Title IV. When the Title IV staff member recommended that the coordinator be moved to Central Office along with other administrators, the superintendent indicated there was no room for him. Dr. William J. Holloway, Chief, Evaluation Review Branch, May 1970.

[27] Names withheld at the request of the individuals interviewed.

[28] Inconsistent goals rampant in the program may be attributed at least in part to the frequency with which leadership changes occurred at the director level of the overall program. One staff member commented that he had served under six directors in 5 years. Dr. Holloway, *supra* at 26.

[29] Interview with Fred Murray, Advisory Specialist, Charlottesville City Schools, March 1970.

[30] Among the charges made were that black students were being called "nigger", black students were being prevented from wearing leather jackets because they were signs of black power, black children had been physically abused by white principals, and expulsion of black students over trivial matters was common. Interview with R. T. Greene, staff specialist, University of Virginia Desegregation Center, and Mrs. Robert Greene, remedial reading teacher, Lane High School, Charlottesville, Va., March 1970.

[31] Interview with Dr. E. W. Rushton, Superintendent, Charlottesville City Schools, March 1970.

[32] Interview with W. A. Johnson, Advisory Specialist, Chesapeake City Schools, Chesapeake, Va., March 1970.

refused it, only when his school was phased out 3 weeks following the original offer.[33] In Danville, Virginia, a black elementary school principal, replaced by a white principal when the school became integrated, was assigned to work in the Title IV program in the central office, and later was reassigned as a special assistant to the superintendent in connection with another Federal program, the Emergency School Assistance Program.[34] Still another black high school principal in Essex County, Virginia, accepted a position as Title IV Advisory Specialist when his school became integrated. Although a black replaced him as principal, the school was downgraded to an intermediate school.[35] As one HEW Title IV member said concerning the selection of Title IV Advisory Specialists: "The selection process had nothing to do with the needs of the program." [36]

Role of the School Superintendent

The school superintendent plays a key role in determining the success or failure of desegregation in a community—indeed, in determining the overall quality of education afforded to the community's children. He is the school system's chief executive officer and it is to him that teachers, principals, members of the school board, parents, and the entire community look for guidance and leadership. Through firm commitment and positive action he can do much to facilitate a successful transition from segregated to integrated education.

For superintendents to assume the leadership role in bringing about successful desegregation requires initiative and often courage. In so doing, they frequently must risk opposition, abuse, and even their jobs. In most communities visited by Commission staff, superintendents have been reluctant to assume this role. Most have adopted essentially passive postures, keeping their involvement in the desegregation process to a minimum. Some have actively opposed desegregation. In a few communities, however, superintendents have exhibited firm resolve and their efforts often have been rewarded, even in areas where opposition to desegregation has been strongest.

For example, J. Bryant Smith, Superintendent of Public Schools in New Albany, Mississippi, was instrumental in moving his community toward acceptance of quality, integrated education. During the summer of 1965, Mr. Smith attended a Title IV desegregation training institute at the University of Mississippi which was concerned with desegregation. The next summer he attended a similar training institute at the university, this time bringing with him several of his key administrators. Largely as a result of his experience at these training institutes, Mr. Smith became convinced of the value of desegregation and began to make efforts to persuade his school board as well.[37]

In 1967, the school board applied for and received a grant of $50,000 from the Kettering Foundation which enabled board members and senior staff persons to visit schools outside the State which had desegregated successfully. These visits had a dramatic effect on the outlook of school board members toward desegregation and toward education generally. As one member said: "We learned that our schools were providing an inferior education for all our students." [38] These out-of-State visits helped bring about change in board members' stereotyped images of minorities. In the course of their visits, they met what they characterized as several "sharp black educators" and recognized that the New Albany schools could benefit from the advice and assistance of local black school personnel.[39]

The primary effect of the visits was to convince the school board that the New Albany School System needed to be completely overhauled, and the members became receptive to suggestions by the superintendent and outside consultants. Among the suggestims for change that the board accepted was one for desegregation.[40] Mr. Smith developed a two-phase plan, calling for desegregation of elementary grades in September of 1968 and desegregation of secondary grades the following year. His plan was adopted by the board.

To help facilitate successful desegregation during the 1968–69 school year, the school board, at Mr. Smith's suggestion, applied for and received a Title IV grant providing funds for an extensive in-service train-

[33] Interview with William Dandy, Director of Title IV Program (1969), Broward County School System, Fort Lauderdale, Fla.

[34] Interview with Curtis Richardson, March 1970. In Virginia during 1969 and 1970, a period of great increase in school desegregation in that State, most persons assigned as Title IV coordinators were former black principals or administrators. During the same period there was a drastic decline in the number of black secondary principals. Between 1965 and 1971 the number of black secondary school principals in Virginia declined from 107 to 17. Interview with J. F. Banks, associate director of secondary education, Virginia State Department of Education, March 1970.

[35] Interview with James Carey, March 1970.

[36] Interview with Miss Edna Ellicott, November 1970, former Title IV member. It should be noted that positions as Title IV coordinators, unlike positions in the local school system, last only so long as the Federal program continues to operate in the locality. Thus the transfer of black school officials from positions as local school administrators to positions as Title IV coordinators can result in a loss of job security. One former black elementary school principal in Nottoway, Virginia, who became an advisory specialist, commented: "I wonder what will hapepn at the end of Title IV. I don't want to slide back in the classroom." Interview with Macio Hill, June 1970.

[37] Interview with J. Bryant Smith, Dec. 4, 1969.

[38] Interview with Dr. Paul K. Shannon, Chairman, New Albany School Board, Dec. 4, 1969.

[39] *Id.*

[40] *Id.*

ing program for elementary school teachers concerned with techniques for team teaching and individualized instruction.

Thus, the process of desegregation in New Albany was linked closely with efforts under Title IV to improve the quality of education and the entire program was enthusiastically received by the faculty.[41] The fact that the desegregation plan was locally designed and implemented on a voluntary basis helped unite the community behind it.

By September 1969, after a year of successful experience with elementary school desegregation, the New Albany School Board prepared to desegregate its secondary schools. At the same time, the national administration was seeking court delays in the implementation of desegregation plans for 30 school districts in Mississippi, indicating a retreat from its resolve to insist upon immediate desegregation. As a result, many Mississippi districts, including a number that bordered on New Albany, reneged on their commitment to desegregate by September 1969. Mr. Smith, however, remained firm, and his faculty remained united behind him. Despite strong pressure to remove the superintendent and delay integration, the school board supported the superintendent and integration in New Albany's secondary schools proceeded uneventfully.[42] Mr. Smith later resigned his position voluntarily to complete studies for his doctorate and accepted a teaching position at Mississippi State College for Women. He continues to serve as a consultant to the New Albany School District.

Hoke County, North Carolina, is another example of commitment and leadership by the school superintendent which contributed significantly to successful desegregation. Hoke County is located in the south central part of North Carolina in a traditionally conservative area. The student population of nearly 5,000 consists of three distinct racial groups—white, black, and American Indian. Until the 1968–69 school year, the county had maintained separate schools for each racial group. The school board had consistently rejected proposals for desegregation made by the school superintendent. In December 1967, the incumbent school superintendent died and was replaced by Donald Abernethy, who previously had been a successful principal in the county school system.

Mr. Abernethy was able to persuade the school board to prepare voluntarily for desegregation, to be accomplished in September 1969. He applied for and obtained a Title IV grant to fund human relations workshops during the months preceding desegregation. The superintendent made special effort to assure that a school board member, as well as teachers of all races, participated in these workshops, which were addressed by leading human relations consultants.[43] According to Mr. Abernethy, the workshops had the effect of decreasing apprehension concerning desegregation among the school teachers of different races and increasing their awareness and sensitivity concerning human relations problems as they worked together and began to know each other.[44]

During the same period, the school board and the superintendent sought to involve the community through a public meeting advertised as an opportunity to discuss consolidation of the district's three high schools. At this meeting, the discussion focused on the issue of school desegregation and a number of questions were asked concerning the necessity for desegregation and how it would work. Opposition was also expressed to the actions the board and the superintendent proposed to take. The superintendent stated frankly that the board had decided to desegregate voluntarily under its own plan, rather than wait for a court order or administrative enforcement proceeding under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The basic reason for this decision, he said, was "because it is right for the school system."[45]

Complete desegregation of the Hoke County School System took place without incident in September of 1969. The faculty as well as students were integrated and school functions and activities were conducted on an integrated basis.

In May 1970, the first school board election following desegregation was held. All incumbent school board members were reelected. The school superintendent has been retained and still occupies his position. In May 1972 another election for school board will be held. No candidate is running on a platform opposed to desegregation. The black community has not proposed a candidate because it is satisfied with the way the schools are being run.[46]

Another school superintendent who sought to lead his community to successful school desegregation was Allen Thornton, Jr., Superintendent of Public Schools for Lauderdale County, Alabama. In 1966 and 1967

[41] *Id.*

[42] *Id.* Despite the success of Title IV grants to facilitate desegregation of the elementary schools, an application for a grant to facilitate secondary school desegregation was rejected by HEW.

[43] Interview with Donald Abernethy, Superintendent, Hoke County Public Schools, Mar. 28, 1970.

[44] *Id.*

[45] *Id.*

[46] *Id.*

desegregation of the Lauderdale County schools was partly accomplished largely through Mr. Thornton's initiative and persistence. He also received Title IV grants for those 2 years to fund programs emphasizing teaching techniques and individualized instruction.

Mr. Thornton was convinced that less than full desegregation was not enough and took steps, with the aid of Title IV, to persuade his school board and the community to accept total desegregation. As he put it: "I did not want to leave the job undone." [47]

He utilized the funds under the Title IV grant to conduct in-service training programs for Lauderdale County teachers and to bring in guest speakers, such as Mrs. Elizabeth Koontz, then President of the National Education Association, and Dr. John Letson, Superintendent of the Atlanta Public School System, who spoke of the advantages of desegregation. Under the Title IV program, teachers of both races were brought together to work cooperatively on dealing with problems that would be encountered in the process of desegregation. The teachers also visited other school systems where desegregation had been successful.

At the time, Mr. Thornton made successful efforts to obtain Federal program money to help improve the quality of school facilities in Lauderdale County. Through funds provided by the Appalachian Regional Commission, a new vocational high school was constructed and named after Mr. Thornton. In September 1968, total desegregation of the Lauderdale County schools was accomplished.

Mr. Thornton, like the superintendents of New Albany and Hoke County, through firm commitment and effective use of Title IV funds, was able to lead his school system to full school desegregation. Unlike the experience of the other two school superintendents, however, his efforts resulted in the loss of his position. In November 1968, after having served as superintendent for 16 consecutive years, Mr. Thornton was defeated in a bid for reelection through a write-in campaign initiated by State and local officials.[48] His successor told Commission staff that he would not have pushed for desegregation unless ordered by the court.[49] After his defeat, Mr. Thornton accepted a position as assistant principal of the new vocational school which carries his name.

Types of Programs Funded

As previously indicated, Section 405 provides for the funding of two types of programs, one for in-service training dealing with problems incident to desegregation and one for the employment of specialists to advise concerning problems incident to desegregation. In practice, however, the distinction has amounted to little more than a difference in the funding mechanism utilized, the level of funding provided, and the greater flexibility in staff selection made possible at higher funding levels. The programs, as they actually have developed, have merged the in-service training and advisory specialist functions of the directors of the two types of programs.

Advisory specialist grants normally have been funded at a lower level than in-service training grants. The advisory specialist program often has utilized existing school district personnel in conducting their programs. The in-service training program, by contrast, has been able to bring in greater numbers of consultants and experts from nearby facilities, such as institutions of higher learning, desegregation centers, and human relations organizations. Thus, the in-service training program has been a richer program and planning has been projected on a broader scale.

Content of Programs

Local programs can conceivably cover a broad range of topics.[50] In the school districts visited by

[47] Interview with Allen Thornton, Jr., Assistant Principal of Allen Thornton, Jr. Vocational School, Lauderdale County, Alabama, Jan. 16, 1970.

[48] Interview with Mr. Thornton's successor, Osbie Tinvelle, Superintendent, Launderdale County Schools, Florence, Ala., Jan. 16, 1970.

[49] *Id.*

[50] A review of grant applications that were accepted yielded the following range of topics: Presentations by specialists on psychological and sociological factors incident to school desegregation, exploration of feelings of persons of representative ethnic groups, techniques for grouping children for instructional purposes, examination of materials in order to create understanding of children with polyethnic backgrounds, exploration of techniques of working with parents through parent-teacher conferences, problems incident to the favorable self-images in children of opposite ethnic groups, Art History, Negro History, Cultural Dialect, Curriculum Development, Children with Learning Difficulties, How Child and Family Service Serves the Family, Teaching Young People in the Detention Home, Education and the Courts, Psychological Aspects of Desegregation, Intellectional and Social Competence of the Disadvantaged, educational needs of disadvantaged children, helping the cross-over teacher communicate with the disadvantaged child, use of behavioral theories and instructional techniques and materials, teaching in a nongraded school, teaching as one of a team, use of standard tests for measurements, television as a classroom tool, communication skill development required to teach effectively in racially mixed classes, Health Practices of the Poor, Consumer Practices of the Poor, Effect of Cultural Deprivation, Nutrition and Intellectual Development, Compensatory Programs, Pre-School Programs, Effective Use of Verbal Behavior in the Classroom, Group Dynamics in the Classroom Setting, Simulations as Learning Devices, Measuring and Evaluating Student Accomplishment and Curriculum Materials, and Processes in Social Studies Patterns of Internal Classroom Organization Designed to Achieve Academic Competence which Promote Worthy Self-Image the Role of Principals, Administrators, Counselors, and Teachers in the Desegregation of Schools.

Source: Proposals for the following School Systems, Williamsburg—James City County School Board (Va.); West Carroll Parish Board (La.); Biloxi Municipal Separate School District (Miss.); Bossier Parish School Board (La.); Asheville City Board of Education (N.C.); Chesapeake Public Schools (Okla.); Enid Public Schools (Okla.); Sampson County Public Schools (N.C.); Alamance County Schools (N.C.); Chesapeake Public Schools (Va.).

Commission staff, activities developed by Title IV coordinators[51] have included publications of a pamphlet about desegregation in the school district (New Albany, Mississippi and Charlottesville, Virginia); development of model or demonstration schools for observation of desegregation techniques (Volusia County, Florida and Muskogee, Oklahoma); and creation of a special teacher corps to advise and train regular faculties in such areas as team teaching, curriculum studies, audio-visual materials, and textbook evaluation (Volusia County, Florida). They also have included visits to minority areas to see first-hand the environment in which minority children live. In Bernalillo County, New Mexico, teachers visited the Santo Domingo Pueblo to attend a mass offered in honor of the Pueblo's patron saint, St. Dominic. The teachers also saw ceremonial dancing, and had a live-in experience at the Cochiti and Santo Domingo pueblos with Indian families.[52] Occasionally, visits have been made to schools or districts in which desegregation already had taken place.[53]

Most programs have placed major emphasis on problems likely to be encountered in teaching the disadvantaged child, on the introduction of new teaching techniques, and on problems of human relations in the classroom.

The usual format has been the formal lecture by a visiting consultant, followed by group discussion of the lecture topic. Some programs also have utilized simulated classroom settings in which teachers can gain experience in teaching a racially mixed group of students. Following observation by colleagues and supervisors, teachers receive suggestions on handling particular issues and problems arising during the teaching session.

Although the desegregation process necessarily involves white as well as black children and teachers, the training sessions have tended to view it as a black problem. In a number of districts visited by Commission staff, black teachers commented on the limitations of this approach. One black teacher said:

> The program [Title IV workshop] was one-sided. Blacks moved into white schools, but the teachers only got information on how to work with blacks.[54]

Another had this to say:

> I thought it was a fine gesture to bring teachers together to discuss the problems. . . . Blacks gave all the information on the characteristics of the disadvantaged [black] child. Blacks got no information from whites on whites.[55]

Muskogee, Oklahoma was again unusual among local recipients of Title IV funds in that school officials recognized the need to deal with the concerns of both races if desegregation were to work. They anticipated, for example, that many whites would fear that desegregation would lower the quality of education available to their children. To overcome these fears, training sessions were devoted to various ways of improving the quality of education. These involved such techniques as team teaching, nongraded classrooms, new programs of art, music, and drama, and the development of innovative types of curriculum. Although the program emphasized quality education, the focus on desegregation remained constant.

Muskogee school officials were also aware of the basic fear among black teachers, parents, and students that desegregation would result in giving them a reduced role in the integrated school system. To meet these fears, the school system consciously involved blacks in every aspect of planning for desegregation, made successful efforts to recruit black administrators for the desegregated system, and took steps to assure that black students would participate as leaders in such student activities as athletics, clubs, student councils, and cheerleaders.

In some cases, the programs have tended to perpetuate the system of segregation. For example, Commission staff viewed a film developed under the McComb, Mississippi, Title IV program which showed segregation throughout the program. Students were shown learning about various occupations. Black students saw black businessmen and white students saw white businessmen. Of special note was the fact that black students saw only blacks in menial trades while whites saw architects, nurses, doctors, and persons in comparable occupations.

Assessment of Local Programs

The realistic standard by which the value of Title IV grants to local educational agencies should be measured is the extent to which the programs they support have helped school districts achieve desegregation with minimum delay, disruption of the educa-

[51] "Coordinators" here refer to advisory specialists or directors of in-service training programs.

[52] Bernalillo Public Schools Tri-Cultural Sensitivity In-Service Training Program Report. Also interview with Arnold J. Rael, Director of Title IV in Bernalillo, February 1970.

[53] *Id.*

[54] Interview with Mrs. Edna S. Sheppard, St. Lucie County, Fla., Apr. 8, 1970.

[55] Interview with Charles Bryant, Classroom Teacher, St. Landry Parish, La., Mar. 8-13, 1970.

tional process, or disharmony in the school and community. The Commission recognizes that many factors other than the Title IV program—the quality of leadership exercised by the school board and its chief administrators, the political climate in the State or locality, the vigor with which Federal Title VI enforcement is pursued—operate to determine the success or failure of school desegregation in particular communities. The effort under Title IV rarely can be decisive and it is difficult to measure with any precision the contribution that LEA grants have made. In view of the sizable amounts of money that have been expended under this aspect of the Title IV program, however, there would appear to be an obligation on the part of HEW and other entities involved to try to determine how effective these grants have been. Such evaluations as have been conducted have been superficial, subjective, and inconclusive.

The one effort by HEW to evaluate the impact of Title IV activities was made in 1966. Because of time pressures, personal visits to local projects to form the basis of a judgment on the value of these programs were precluded.[56] Thus, the evaluation was based entirely on an analysis of files. In fact, the evaluation report reached no conclusion regarding the quality and effectiveness of the programs.[57] So loose was the control exercised by HEW Title IV staff members that they were even unable to inform the staff investigator when training sessions were being held.[58] Some assessments of local programs have been made by grant recipients, participants, or outside evaluators. These, however, typically have been far from thorough or objective.[59]

At the local level most school administrators interviewed by Commission staff were convinced that the Title IV program had helped their districts, but seldom could specify the contributions it had made. For example, the Title IV director in Moore County, North Carolina expressed the benefits from the Title IV program only in general terms, such as: helping teachers of both races to work together, building better race relations generally, and avoiding many racial problems which might have arisen.[60]

A Georgia school official indicated the ". . . one accomplishment of the program was the fact that the community knew that we recognized the problems and were trying to do something about them!" [61] Another Georgia official said:

> Our teachers [black and white] associated in a learning situation, and they learned that they had similar problems, yet both had unique problems. . . . If not for the program, we would have had a lot more trouble than we had.[62]

A school principal in McComb, Mississippi told Commission staff that the program brought two groups of educators together to communicate. "Before, we had no communication whatsoever." [63]

Faculty and administrators in New Albany, Mississippi, where total integration was achieved without serious incident in September 1969, were somewhat more explicit: "Without Title IV we could not have convinced the faculty, which influenced the school board." [64]

According to one account of the New Albany program:

> . . . this project is unique in that it is designed to improve the quality of instruction for every child while providing acceptance for and a smooth transition to complete desegregation.[65]

According to this report, published by the school district itself, the program demonstrated that introduction of new teaching techniques could result in improving the quality of education for black and white students in New Albany. Other elements which contributed to success in New Albany were said to be frank discussions of human relations issues which helped teachers of different races work together cooperatively in developing programs for team teaching and individualized instruction. The element of "continuous progress," under which children may move to the next level of difficulty as soon as they have mastered the material, was another important factor.[66]

Persons interviewed elsewhere repeated the theme that the Title IV program had provided faculty and other school officials with new experiences across racial lines. In Hoke County, North Carolina where, it will be recalled, the population contains three major groups—blacks, whites, and American Indians—the mere fact of holding joint faculty meetings was consid-

[56] Report by Mrs. Sherry Arnstein, *Self Evaluation of Title IV* (EEOP), at 28 (1966).

[57] *Id.*

[58] *Id.*

[59] Participants in training programs have been asked by program leaders to rate the speakers on a three or four point scale and to make narrative comments on the value of the sessions.

[60] Interview with Lawrence H. Robinson, Title IV Director, Moore County Schools, Carthage, N.C., Jan. 27, 1970.

[61] Interview with J. Edwin Stowe, Superintendent, Stephens County Schools, Toccoa, Ga., February 1970.

[62] Interview with C. N. England, Director of Special Services, Clayton County School District, Jonesboro, Ga., Feb. 24, 1970.

[63] Interview with John Gilmore, Principal, Higgins High School, McComb, Miss., Dec. 10, 1969.

[64] Interview with O. Wayne Gann, High School Principal, New Albany, Miss., December 1969.

[65] *The New Albany Story*, New Albany Independent School District, New Albany, Miss., 1969.

[66] *Id.*

ered a momentous achievement. The current superintendent told Commission staff:

> This program brought together for the first time the teachers of all three races. They wrestled with many of the problems they would ultimately face when they began teaching in integrated schools. But most valuable, I think, was the experience of learning to work together as teachers.[67]

In McComb, Mississippi, the coordinator of the Title IV program reported that the major benefit of the program was that white teachers began speaking to black teachers when they met downtown after the program.[68]

In Richmond, Virginia, a participant commented on the city's Title IV program: "It was the first time blacks and whites could work together and respect each other." [69]

And in Silver City, New Mexico, the Title IV Coordinator reported:

> The purpose of the program is to get the two groups to communicate. . . . We have made a beginning in realizing the purpose. The groups [Chicano and white Anglo] are talking to each other.[70]

Some participants interviewed by Commission staff were more critical of the Title IV pr[illegible] teacher who took part in several workshops [illegible] regation noted severe limitations in their e[illegible]

> We've got to live this stuff. It won't do [illegible] good to talk about integration if people still refuse to cooperate. While it was helpful to the participants, the most prejudiced persons did not take part.[71]

This observation was common to many of the programs since participation usually has been on a voluntary basis. There were also numerous complaints that the program did not deal with the specific issue of desegregation, but rather concentrated on materials and techniques with which any good teacher should already be acquainted.

One teacher complained:

> The program was on teacher techniques. They told us what to do and how. I think it failed because they were not talking about the children we would have to teach. It was boring. I thought I was going to die. The consultants were paid $100 a day plus travel expenses to tell us how to teach.[72]

Several participants in Title IV programs expressed the view that the workshops were inadequate in that they failed to consider fears of desegregation felt by minority faculty, students, and parents. As previously noted, few instances were found by Commission staff where attention was given to the fear of black teachers and principals that they might lose their jobs, be demoted, or otherwise have problems in a newly integrated, formerly white school. Nor was adequate attention paid to the possibility that black students, parents, and teachers might resist leaving a familiar situation in which there was pride in long-standing traditions.

That these fears were not unfounded was reported by a black school official in Biloxi, Mississippi, who described to Commission staff the experiences of black students who transferred to the white high school:

> Two girls who chose to go to white schools stayed only six weeks. The students at Biloxi High School did not let them into their social groups. Many students here were disappointed because of [illegible] lack of warmth at the white high school. . . . They felt left out.[73]

His remarks were confirmed in interviews with students who had attended Biloxi High School. As one black student put it: "You feel very alone when you don't have any friends." [74]

Basic Weaknesses of Local Programs

In the course of Commission staff investigations into the working of local Title IV programs, a number of basic weaknesses have been revealed. One has been the lack of sufficient resources for funding them. The typical grant to an individual school district has been about $50,000 for a training program and even less for an advisory specialist program. While these amounts may appear impressive, particularly in relation to the budgets of small school systems, they are miniscule in relation to the enormity of the problems of behavioral and attitudinal change that school sys-

---

[67] Interview with Donald Abernethy, *supra* note 43.

[68] Interview with W. L. Tobias, Director, Title IV Program, McComb, Miss., Dec. 10, 1969.

[69] Nathaniel Lee, Director of Title IV, Richmond City Schools, Richmond, Va., March 1970.

[70] Interview with Mrs. Maria Guttierez Spencer, Silver City Schools, N. Mex., February 1970.

[71] Interview with Leonard G. Jewett, Teacher, Hampton City Schools, Mar. 16, 1970.

[72] Interview with Mrs. Dorothy Sealy, Teacher, Hardy High School, Chattanooga, Tenn., Feb. 27, 1970.

[73] Interview with Bruce Steward, Student, Biloxi School District, Biloxi, Miss., January 1970.

[74] Interview with Philip Gaudy, Student, Biloxi School District, Biloxi, Miss., January 1970.

tems must meet in the process of desegregation.[75] Further, even where sufficient funds have been available to enable districts to initiate effective Title IV programs, there has seldom been continuing financial assistance so that the gains could be reenforced.

Insufficient funds, however, have by no means been the sole, or even primary, weakness in the local Title IV programs. Perhaps the most serious shortcoming the Commission has found has been the lack of clear consistent goals which the programs had been expected to achieve. From the beginning, the entire Title IV program has been characterized by a failure at the national level to enunciate goals and to delineate appropriate strategies for program emphasis. Confusion nationally has been reflected in local school districts and has led to the funding of programs which have dealt only indirectly and peripherally with desegregation.

Consequently, many local programs have not come to grips with specific desegregation issues. Instead they have focused almost entirely on teaching techniques and on imparting information relevant to understanding the so-called disadvantaged child. As one white participant said of the program she attended: "The sessions treated educational problems, but not the unique problems caused by teaching in desegregated schools." [76]

So gingerly has the approach to desegregation often been that another teacher told Commission staff that she had not even been aware that the program was related to desegregation. As far as she could tell the program has been designed to provide understanding of poor children.[77] She felt that she had not derived any benefit which helped prepare her for a desegregated classroom. The failure to establish goals related specifically to desegregation is also apparent in the statement made by a school official in Biloxi, Mississippi, who explained that the major focus of a training course funded by Title IV was "remedial reading." [78]

In short, many Title IV programs have been directed primarily toward educational goals and only secondarily, and often remotely, to the goal of desegregation. In the many school districts visited by Commission staff, there were few success stories in Title IV programming because desegregation issues were ignored or kept as a hidden agenda.

Many local programs have been further weakened by the permissiveness of superintendents and administrators in determining participation on a voluntary basis, leaving out those most in need of information and guidance on desegregation.

Still another flaw has been the failure to involve the community-at-large in the desegregation process. Typically, efforts under Title IV have been confined to those officially connected with the school system, but community leaders rarely have been asked to participate or even to support desegregation. Administrators of these programs have assumed community opposition to the purposes of Title IV and, rather than seeking to change the perceived climate of opinion, have accepted it and approached the task of overcoming the problems incident to desegregation timidly and equivocally. These programs have been of limited value. By contrast, in several cases where programs have been successful, a key element has been a determined effort by local administrators to involve community leadership. For example, administrators in Muskogee, Oklahoma, and Moore County and Hoke County, North Carolina, set about the task of desegregation by making an affirmative effort to enlist and mold community leadership support. In all three school districts desegregation took place without serious incident.

In addition, the Title IV programs in LEA's were never integral parts of the school system's administrative structure and, therefore, the director could not influence personnel selection, budgeting, school site selection, and other major activities which tend to support, perpetuate, or break up segregation.[79]

Finally, the program has suffered from local autonomy in the operation of the programs. As the director of one university desegregation center told Commission staff:

> Behind the theory of the LEA grant are the assumptions (1) that they [local educational agencies] can analyze their own problems and, (2) that they have the talent to run an effective program to solve the problem. We do not think that those assumptions are commonly fulfilled in our State.[80]

He concluded: "The LEA grant program is ineffective in that it requires a sick patient to cure himself." [81]

---

[75] One former Branch Chief in the Division of Equal Educational Opportunities in Washington commented that LEA grants were funded at a "paltry level" as was the entire Title IV program thereby making national desegregation impossible. The political leadership should have been aware of the consequences of such a funding level.

[76] Interview with Mrs. Brenda Berryhill, teacher, Tuscaloosa County, Ala., Feb. 13, 1970.

[77] Interview with Mrs. Venie Yancy, teacher, Madison County, Ga., Feb. 25, 1970.

[78] Final report of Title IV project, February 1966 to June 1966, p. 1. Remarks of Bill Lee, Assistant Superintendent, Biloxi Public Schools.

[79] Dr. William J. Holloway, Evaluation Review Branch, May 1970.

[80] Interview with Glen Hontz, Director, Educational Resource Center on School Desegregation, New Orleans, La., Mar. 11, 1970.

[81] *Id.*

CHAPTER IV

UNIVERSITY DESEGREGATION CENTERS

Introduction

The Federal Government makes grants under two sections of Title IV to institutions of higher learning to meet the problems incident to desegregation. Under Section 403, colleges or universities, under contract with the U.S. Office of Education, provide technical assistance to local school boards in preparing and implementing desegregation plans.[1] Under Section 404, the institutions, under grant or contract with the Office of Education, conduct training institutes for school personnel.[2] Since 1968 grants under both sections have been merged under a single program. These forms of assistance are provided through "desegregation centers" which are often affiliated with a university's school of education from which they draw heavily for staff and other resources.[3]

Center activities include training programs and short-term conferences for school districts, and assistance to local districts in the preparation of proposals for direct assistance under Title IV. They often conduct local surveys and studies to pinpoint desegregation problems and develop and distribute desegregation materials to local school districts. Centers also give assistance in planning, evaluation, and reporting on local school system projects supported under Title IV.

Although the first center was established in 1965, less than a year after enactment of Title IV, it was not until 1968 that the center concept became a key element in the operation of Title IV. In Fiscal Year 1966, less than $341,000 was expended on centers, followed by an even lower expenditure of $236,000 in 1967. Rapidly thereafter, the figures jumped to $2.8 million in 1968 and to almost $3.6 million in 1969. By 1970, the expenditure for centers had more than doubled to $8,168,391. This increase reflected the additional expense to be incurred by virtue of technical assistance provisions of university desegregation center contracts, and the anticipated increase in center activity in the preparation of desegregation plans for school systems ordered to desegregate pursuant to court orders directing that assistance be rendered by center personnel and Title IV staff. By 1971, most desegregation plans had been written and a reduction to $5,145,621 occurred in allocations to centers for technical assistance. This amount, however, still represented an increase of 1½ times the amount expended in 1969.[4]

In the early years following enactment of Title IV, training institutes at colleges and universities were separately funded and administered under Section 404. These were designed as short-term training programs "to improve the ability of teachers, supervisors, counselors, and other elementary or secondary school personnel to deal effectively with special educational problems occasioned by desegregation."[5] Although the Office of Education still funds occasional independent training institutes under Section 404, most university-run training activities are now operated through the continuing desegregation centers and are part of an overall effort to provide technical assistance.

The Institute Program

Training institutes played a significant role in the operation of the Title IV program in its early years. Between 1965 and 1967 nearly $9.5 million, or more than 40 percent of the total Title IV budget, was spent on institute programs. By contrast, in the years 1968 through 1971, the amount spent on institutes was only $3.6 million, or 6.2 percent of the overall Title IV monies spent for that period.[6]

A total of 65 colleges and universities in the Southern and border States has sponsored 162 training institutes for local school personnel. These institutions have been approximately evenly divided between private and public colleges and universities. Thirty-one

[1] Civil Rights Act of 1964, PL 88-352, Title IV, Section 403. Section 403 authorizes the Commissioner of Education "to render technical assistance in the preparation, adoption, and implementation of plans for the desegregation of public schools." This technical assistance was initially provided directly by the Office of Education through its own staff and the use of consultants. Since 1966, however, the Office of Education has increasingly used the services of colleges or universities which are under contract to provide technical assistance within a particular geographical area.

[2] Civil Rights Act of 1964, PL 88-352, Title IV, Section 404.

[3] Desegregation centers have been established in the Southern and border States in order to provide services within States' geographic areas. Recently, there have been several such centers in the North and West.

[4] 1971 figures may not be final as contracts may be amended to include additional expenses incurred during 1971-72. See Table C2.

[5] Civil Rights Act of 1964, PL 88-352, Title IV, Section 404.

[6] See Table D1.

institutes were held at 18 colleges with predominantly black student enrollments.[7] Most institutes were held under the auspices of the school of education within the college.

The institute program was based largely on recommendations of the Special Task Force established in 1963 in anticipation of passage of civil rights legislation which would bring substantial school desegregation responsibilities to the Office of Education. The task force expected institutes to concentrate primarily on development of techniques in human relations and on design of curricular content for children from an "atypical environment".[8]

Program emphasis needed to be developed, stated the Task Force Report, so that the limited resources could be used most effectively.[9] Further, the report recommended that an effort be made to identify situations which could be developed as prototype projects and that a priority system be established for the evaluation of applications received in response to program announcements.[10]

In December 1964, a Leadership Conference on Institutes, composed of specialists in education, school administration, the behavioral sciences, and community intergroup organizations, was held at the University of Maryland.[11] The specialists considered the geographical areas which should be served by the institutes, appropriate subject content for institutes, the kinds of school desegregation problems institute programs should consider, evaluation techniques, and desired followup programs.[12] The final conference report provided a working document that was later utilized by Title IV staff in developing guidelines and procedures for operation of the program. Many of the recommendations were incorporated in materials disseminated to prospective applicants.

The report focused on procedural issues, such as format, eligibility for participation, and geographical areas where the assistance of training institutes would be needed. Thus the conference concluded that:

—Where several institutions of higher learning could jointly plan with adjacent interested school districts, an institute might have a better chance of achieving its goal.

—Personnel recruited for institutes could be of several kinds. The statutory term "school personnel" was defined broadly to include school nurses, bus drivers, and professional community persons concerned with education, as well as those traditionally considered school personnel.

—Participation by teams of school personnel from a given school system was preferable to individuals because they could be more effective in facilitating desegregation plans when they returned home.

—Although areas in the South where the problems were most severe and compliance most difficult might well request and need assistance most, acute problems of desegregation existed in other parts of the country and merited consideration and assistance.

Those institutions of higher education which expressed early interest in developing training institutes on desegregation were sent copies of a *Policies and Procedures Manual for Training Institutes.*[13] The *Manual* provided guidelines for developing institute proposals and designated format and time limits for submission. It encouraged colleges and universities interested in holding institutes to seek out school districts to persuade them to participate.[14] One reason why the *Manual* encouraged these contacts was to enable school systems facing or anticipating school desegregation problems to plan the institute proposal jointly. Such joint planning would offer opportunities for most effectively utilizing available resources within the school districts.[15] Later, when the program became more widely known and accepted, school districts became more directly active in seeking participation from the colleges and universities.

Content of Institute Program

The *Manual*, like the *Leadership Conference Report*, emphasized issues of procedure and provided little guidance for the content or specific objectives to be met by the institutes, except to state broadly that the purpose of institutes was to:

> improve the ability of teachers, supervisors, counselors, and other elementary or secondary school personnel to deal effectively with special educational problems occasioned by desegregation.[16]

In discussing the content of programs directed toward this purpose, the *Manual* stated:

---

[7] See Table D5.

[8] Luddington Task Force Report, at 1.

[9] *Id.*

[10] *Id.*

[11] Office of Education Report . . . Leadership Conference on Institutes, 1965, University of Maryland, Dec. 16–19, 1964.

[12] *Id.*

[13] Equal Educational Opportunities Program, *Policies and Procedures for Institutes for Special Training on Problems of School Desegregation*, 1964.

[14] *Id.*

[15] *Id.*

[16] *Id.* This statement in fact is simply a partial restatement of Section 404 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, p. 1.

> Institute programs may be developed with respect to any of the special educational problems occasioned by desegregation in public elementary or secondary schools. . . . Sociological, psychological, curricular, instructional, or administrative topics may be considered as long as there is logical relationship to problems associated with the assignment of students to public schools and within such schools without regard to their race, color, religion or national origin.[17]

The *Manual* provided that acceptable programs could cover a broad range of subject matter so long as there was a logical relationship to problems associated with the process of elementary and secondary school desegregation. Further, it provided that programs were to be aimed primarily at school personnel who could influence others in the district, to be oriented toward action on specific desegregation problems, to provide for followup relationships between institute staff and participants, and to provide interdisciplinary approaches to school desegregation problems.[18] It also suggested that areas of administration and curriculum were particularly pertinent to desegregation problems and were the concern of each level of the school district hierarchy, implying that these were desirable areas for institute programming.[19]

Although the *Manual* offered only general guidelines on program content related to desegregation, it was specific, and even emphatic, about educational content:

> It is the philosophy of this program that "the special educational problems occasioned by desegregation" referred to in the Act are just that: namely, *educational* problems. . . . Such matters as motivation for learning, academic achievement, methods of instruction, instructional materials, design and content of curriculum, counselling and guidance, teacher attitudes and the organization of classrooms, teacher staffs and schools would seem to be of paramount importance.[20]

The failure to establish requirements or specific guidance on how institute programs should relate to desegregation left Federal officials with little in the way of objective standards by which to judge the worth of institute proposals. This led to the approval of proposals of minimal value for purposes of desegregation. In discussing early institutes funded under Title IV, one Federal administrator stated: "We were very naive about the implications of the proposals. There were a lot of proposals on compensatory education. We accepted them as good then. Looking back, they were horrible." [21] He concluded: "We were probably okaying things that did more harm than good." [22]

At the time the Commission undertook its investigation, the institute program had been largely de-emphasized, except as part of a larger university involvement in desegregation. Thus, examination of the actual operation of individual institute programs was not possible. Furthermore, few written reports on the program exist. Evaluation, therefore, necessarily relied heavily upon interviews with former institute directors, with central office personnel in Washington, and with former participants in institute programs.

According to institute reports available to Commission staff and interviews with officials and participants, the emphasis of institutes was frequently on new types of teaching techniques and problems of the disadvantaged, but was rarely focused directly on desegregation.

For example, an institute held at Knoxville College, Knoxville, Tennessee, in 1967, dealt mainly with language arts. Lecture topics included: linguistic awareness, dialect study, effective strategies for teaching poetry, understanding the "world of work", and improving writing ability. There is no record that these topics were in any way related to desegregation. The program also included a presentation by two performing artists who read works from black authors.[23]

Other institutes had titles which clearly suggested a focus other than desegregation. For instance, a 1965 institute at Auburn University in Auburn, Alabama was entitled "Special Training Institute for Teachers of Culturally Deprived Children." There was one attempt at interracial training at the Auburn institute,

---

[17] Equal Educational Opportunities Program, *Policies and Procedures for Institutes for Special Training on Problems of School Desegregation*, 1964. This statement in fact is simply a partial restatement of Section 404 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, p. 1.

[18] *Id.*

[19] Although no detailed requirements concerning program content were provided in the *Manual*, there were indications of matters which might be analyzed by school districts within a training institute program: understanding different value systems of different racial and class subcultures in the community and the implication of these for the classroom situation, understanding characteristics of an impoverished community and the nature, causes, and effects of cultural deprivation, means of organizing the school and classroom for improved instructional quality, development of appropriate vocational, special education, and other specialized programs designed to provide instruction appropriate to individual student differences, procedures for dealing with disciplinary problems in desegregated schools resulting from lack of communication among students, planning content, organization and conduct of extracurricular activities in situations involving students of different backgrounds. *Id.* pp. 3-4.

[20] Equal Educational Opportunities Program, *Policies and Procedures for Institutes for Special Training on Problems of School Desegregation*, 1964, pp. 4 and 5.

[21] Interview with Darl Hulit, HEW, Central Office, Title IV, Apr. 1, 1970.

[22] *Id.*

[23] Interview with Dr. Ralph Martin, Knoxville College, Feb. 17, 1970.

which consisted of a picnic intended to encourage free communication between participants and staff. The picnic also was meant to provide a casual setting so participants could share their views regarding issues of desegregation informally. However, since there were only two black teachers among the 50 participants, it is unlikely that the cause of interracial understanding was significantly advanced.[24]

A number of institute programs included visits to low-income neighborhoods from which many black children could be expected to come. A summer institute in 1967 held at Hampton Institute in Virginia dealt with problems of teaching disadvantaged children and included trips to playgrounds, community centers, clubs, and youth service organizations in a low-income neighborhood, so that institute participants could observe the out-of-school habitat of the children whom they might be instructing in the fall.[25]

One example of a program aimed specifically at meeting problems of desegregation was a summer training institute on group integration in desegregated schools held in Spring Hill College, Mobile, Alabama in 1967.[26] The major objectives were to develop group leadership skills of educational personnel involved in desegregation, to improve group participation skills of educators, to promote integration of working teams of educators at all levels of the school system, and to develop the classroom management potential of teachers by providing specialized training in group development skills in an integrated classroom setting.[27] The institute also sought to explore aspects of group interaction and modern techniques of group problem solving to facilitate the desegregation process. Among the subjects included in the training sessions were the social psychology of the small group, the dynamics of group development in the desegregated school, and the management of the biracial group in the desegregated school.[28] In short, the entire program was directed to various elements of desegregation within the school system.

Staff of Institutes

The directors of the institutes were, for the most part, faculty members from the sponsoring schools of education. They included professors of education, directors of teacher education programs, directors of educational research, chairmen of education divisions, and deans of schools of education.[29] There were also a few professors of sociology and psychology who served as institute directors. In those cases, the institutes emphasized issues of human behavior and human development, rather than educational technique.[30]

Statistical data on the racial or ethnic background of institute directors and their staffs are unavailable. Commission staff inquiries, however, revealed that principal personnel of institutes were almost invariably white. Of the 13 colleges that responded to the Commission's inquiry, only one—St. Augustine's College, a predominantly black institution—had a black institute director.[31] At an institute held in 1969 at West Virginia Wesleyan College, which dealt with updating interethnic aspects of public school education in West Virginia and strengthening community rapport regarding equal educational opportunities, the staff director of the institute, the associate director and other staff members were all white. In addition, all institute consultants from outside the State, with one exception, were white.[32]

Institute Participants

Section 404 requires that persons selected for participation in institutes be "school personnel".[33] Ths term was interpreted broadly by the Office of Education to include not only principals, counselors, and teachers, but also cafeteria workers, bus drivers, and school nurses.[34] About 70 percent of all institutes were held for teachers, about 18 percent for administrative personnel, and about 12 percent for other school personnel. Occasionally, participants also included community leaders involved in community organizations concerned with the educational process within the school district. Two institutes involving community leaders

[24] See Final Report, 1965 Summer Institute, Auburn University, Auburn, Ala.

[25] See Director's Technical Report, 1968 Summer Institute, Hampton Institute, Hampton, Va.

[26] Summer Training Institute on Group Integration in the Desegregated School, a proposal of the Spring Hill College, Mobile, Ala.

[27] *Id.*

[28] *Id.*

[29] *Id.*

[30] *Id.*

[31] Commission Staff Survey.

[32] A 1-year program for updating interethnic aspects of public school education in West Virginia and for strengthening community support in regard to equal educational opportunities held in 1969–70. Out-of-State consultants included Dr. Ralph B. Kimbrough of the University of Florida, Dr. Joe Hall, Dr. Claud Kitchens and Dr. Samuel B. Ethridge. Dr. Ethridge was the only out-of-State consultant who was black and who was not a part of the Title IV program.

[33] Section 404 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 provides: The Commissioner is authorized to arrange, through grants or contracts, with institutions of higher education for the operation of short-term or regular session institutes for special training designed to improve the ability of teachers, supervisors, counselors, and other elementary or secondary personnel to deal effectively with special educational problems occasioned by desegregation. Individuals who attend such an institute on a full-time basis may be paid stipends for the period of their attendance at such institute in amounts specified by the Commissioner in regulations, including allowances for travel to attend such institute.

[34] Interview with Dr. William J. Holloway, Evaluation Branch Chief, May 1970. See also, Office of Education Report of the Leadership Conference on Institutes (1965) at 5.

were held in 1965 at the University of Mississippi and Auburn University.[35]

Most elementary and secondary school teachers who participated in the institutes were selected by the principals of their schools. Participants usually included both blacks and whites although black representation was often on a token basis. The teachers came from the same school district to attend an institute. Participation was almost always voluntary. In fact, according to a number of former institute participants, a teacher usually had to express special interest before he was asked by his principal to attend.[36] Thus, teachers who might be most in need of training available at institutes—those unsympathetic or uninterested in desegregation—were least likely to participate.

In addition, teachers selected for participation were not necessarily those who had been or would be assigned to desegregated classrooms when they returned. This, according to the *Manual*, was a matter left to determination by the college operating the particular institute.[37] While the institute program was supposed to be concerned specifically with training school personnel to deal effectively with problems of desegregation, the participants were not necessarily those persons who would have occasion to profit directly from the training.

One of the few institutes which did require that its participants teach in desegregated settings was held at Paul Quinn College in Waco, Texas in 1968.[38] The institute participants were recent graduates of Paul Quinn, Baylor University, and other colleges, who had signed contracts to teach in the Waco area schools as "crossover" teachers.[39]

Another institute which made teaching in a desegregated school a requirement for participation was held at the University of Miami, in Coral Gables, Florida, during the summer of 1966.[40] Forty teachers from the South Florida area were chosen to participate after they had indicated that they would be teaching in desegregated schools in the 1966–67 school year.

Unlike teacher training institutes, those for school administrators (i.e., principals, school board members, and superintendents) generally included only one type of administrator from several adjacent school districts. In cases where selections were necessary, the superintendent usually decided who would attend.

The institute program made only an occasional effort to involve the community outside the school system. The Leadership Conference at the University of Maryland in 1964 had viewed the statutory term "school personnel" as a category which could include community organization persons and community leaders. Generally, however, Office of Education contractors subscribed to the view that people in the community who had no clear connections with the schools should not be trained under Title IV.[41] Thus, few institute programs permitted participation by community leaders who did not have some formal affiliation with the school system.

Nevertheless, two institutes were held at the University of Mississippi and Auburn University in 1965 which did involve community leaders.[42] The University of Mississippi program included not only school administrators and school boards members, but also a few persons suggested by school superintendents as holding leadership positions in the community.[43] The Auburn University program included only two community persons out of a total of 178 institute participants. Such limited participation by leaders from the community suggests that the institute program, like other programs under Title IV, failed to involve the broader community in the desegregation process.

Commission staff found only one case in which students played a significant role in training institutes.[44] At the Hampton Institute program, mentioned earlier, about 25 students, then enrolled in desegregated schools, were brought in to recount their experiences and problems of adjustment. The teachers were also given an opportunity to utilize new teaching techniques and material developed during the institute while working with these children.

Although the Office of Education *Manual* specified that institutes were to be biracial, in the early days there was often only token participation by blacks.[45] As previously noted, the institute on teaching culturally deprived children at Auburn University had only two black participants among a group of 50 teachers.

---

[35] The Leadership Conference viewed "participation by school personnel" as a wide net including community leaders. University of Maryland (1965).

[36] Commission staff interviews with Institute participants.

[37] Office of Education Policies and Procedures Manual for Institutes at 28.

[38] Proposal for funding of 1968 Institute on Cross-over Teacher Training, Paul Quinn College.

[39] *Id.*

[40] Leadership Training Institute for Advanced University Study for Teachers of Newly Desegregated Schools. Final Technical Report. 1966 Teacher Training Institute, University of Miami.

[41] See Final Reports of Texas Southern University, 1968 and the University of Miami, 1965.

[42] See Final Reports for University of Mississippi, 1965 and Auburn University, 1965.

[43] Among the topics covered in the institute were the provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, procedures used by various school districts to carry out desegregation, and planning of future courses of action to be followed in the districts participating in the institute. The number of community leaders participating is not known.

[44] The institute on the School Principalship held July 1, 1968 through Feb. 28, 1969 at Texas Southern University had a black and white student explain to the participants the students' expectations in desegregated school situations.

[45] See Final Report, Auburn University, 1965 Summer Institute.

Early institutes for superintendents and school board members also lacked black participants, largely because few school systems employed black persons at policy-making administrative levels.

Instructional Techniques and Format

According to institute proposals and reports, the most frequently used instructional technique for institutes was the formal lecture, preceded by assignment of readings on the lecture topic, and followed by group discussion. The speakers were usually college professors and their fields of specialization ranged from education and the behavioral sciences to mathematics and science.

Lecturers utilized in the institutes often came from the faculties of education and the social sciences at the host institution or from neighboring colleges and universities. Noted specialists in intergroup relations or other facets of the social sciences were occasionally brought in from universities or public school systems. These were usually suggested by Office of Education personnel or were persons already known to the institute directors. Presidents and professional staff from black institutions were used considerably less often, except at those institutes held in black institutions.

Institutes were criticized from the outset for their rigid adherence to traditional learning techniques and lack of imagination. For example, an internal memorandum by Office of Education staff stated in 1966 that few institute staff "had tried or even heard of innovative techniques. . . . Most discussion groups were being led by people inexperienced in sensitivity training or human relations." [46] The memorandum also expressed disappointment over the fact that there were few efforts to simulate classroom settings as laboratories so that participants could actually experience teaching on an integrated basis.[47]

There were other, more basic, dissatisfactions with the institute program. One was recognition that training is only a single element necessary to carry out a successful desegregation program. In addition, the institute program, as initially conceived in 1964, provided only for a one-time project for each school district rather than a continuing effort as communities actually engaged in the desegregation process. Finally, there was a growing recognition that an institution of higher learning could make many contributions to the entire concept in addition to training teachers and other school personnel.

For example, a college or university possessed the capacity to provide technical assistance, then being provided by U.S. Office of Education staff and consultants, to local school districts. It also would be able to respond more quickly and effectively than the Office of Education to problems in the local districts because of its closer proximity and more limited territorial responsibility. In addition, universities could provide a convenient umbrella for institutes that would permit staff to assess on a continuing basis existing programs within a school district and to follow up on them frequently. A university also had on hand a ready supply of faculty and staff with varied skills and backgrounds to assist in resolving problems. Finally, there would be opportunity for developing stronger relationships between consultants and local school authorities because of increased frequency of contacts.

In short, the potential role of universities was viewed as extending beyond that of merely serving as a resource for training to becoming centers for providing a full range of continuing desegregation services.

Desegregation Centers

The concept of desegregation centers was not contemplated at the time of the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, but interpretations of Section 403 (technical assistance) and Section 404 (grants or contracts with institutions of higher education) by the Office of General Counsel at HEW provided the legal undergirding necessary for the development of this concept.[48]

At the peak of the Center program activity in 1970, there were 15 university-based desegregation centers in the United States.[49] All except two of those centers

[46] Sherry Arnstein, *supra* note 36 at 12.

[47] *Id.*

[48] The thesis set forth by the HEW Office of General Counsel was that "the Commissioner could tell . . . the University to provide technical assistance in accordance with requests from any 'school board' within a particular geographical area and that it would be unnecessary to make any referrals to the Office of Education except where the contractor had reason to question the status of the applicant as a 'school board' or where it was unable to render the technical assistance requested."

Although this memorandum provided the legal foundation for the development of Centers, one additional reason why Centers were so eagerly sought as a Title IV approach was that each contract for an Institute had to be separately processed. With a limited staff, paper work was increasingly oppressive, and delays in funding legion. The Center was one means of making a single grant or contract provide support for a given year which had to meet the rigid funding style of the Office of Education only once for the several program components. Title IV contracts for establishment of Centers to Deal with Problems of Desegregation—Use of State Education Agencies and Universities, p. 3, Aug. 24, 1967.

[49] Auburn University, University of South Alabama, Ouachita Baptist University, University of Miami at Coral Gables, University of Georgia, Tulane University, Mississippi State University, University of New Mexico, Teachers College of Columbia University, University of Oklahoma, St. Augustine's College, University of South Carolina, University of Tennessee, University of Texas, and the University of Virginia. The University of Southern Mississippi Center has been replaced by Mississippi State University. In addition, the University of Delaware Center and Western Kentucky University are no longer being funded. Three additional centers established following completion of the Commission's field work are not included in this study. (University of California at Riverside, the National Center for Research and Information for Equal Educational Opportunities at Columbia University, and the Office of Research and Field Services at the School of Education at the University of Pittsburgh).

were located in Southern or border States.[50] Currently, despite a lower level of funding, there are 17.[51] Twelve are in publicly supported institutions and five are in private colleges or universities.[52] Sixteen of the institutions are predominantly white in student enrollment, and one is predominantly black.[53]

Relationship to University

Despite the potentially significant role that Centers can play in helping to resolve a problem of paramount national concern, there is some indication that the universities at which they are located view them in a lesser light. For example, while a few of the Centers have been allotted good central accommodations within their institutions, the physical location of several suggests that they suffer from a low status. Thus, the University of New Mexico Center is located in the cramped space of one room, although it has a full-time staff of eight persons. The University of Miami Center is housed in an unairconditioned building on a campus where airconditioning is generally regarded as standard equipment. The Center at the University of Georgia is located near the University's duplicating equipment behind some rest rooms and on a floor directly above shop equipment.

Several other Centers, while housed in adequate quarters, are located well away from the college campus. For example, the Center at the University of South Alabama is found on a separate campus formerly used as an armed services base several miles distant from most other university activities.

Universities, also, have shown little pride in their association with desegration centers. They have made no effort to publicize the existence of desegregation centers on their campuses. In some cases, they even have taken action to prevent such publicity. Thus, in 1969, efforts by the desegregation center at the University of Georgia to distribute a newsletter providing information to school officials on current developments and problems in school desegregation were suppressed at the express order of the university administration.[54] Center staff as well has exhibited a similar reluctance to be identified with desegregation. In response to telephone calls made to centers, only one indicated that it had any connection with desegregation.[55] The others responded in a variety of ways, none of which suggested a school desegregation function:

"Special Programs"[56]
"Auburn Center"[57]
"TEDTAC"[58]
"3213"[59]
"Education Center"[60]
"Educational Resource Center"[61]
"General Extension"[62]
"Human Relations Center"[63]
"Consultative Center"[64]
"Cultural Awareness Center"[65]
"Technical Assistance"[66]
"Educational Planning Center"[67]

Staffing Patterns

As in the case of institute programs, Center staffing patterns have tended to reflect the attendance patterns of the institutions in which they are located.[68] Of the

[50] University of New Mexico Cultural Awareness Center at Albuquerque, New Mexico and the National Center for Research and Information for Equal Educational Opportunities at Columbia University (Teachers College).

[51] Auburn University, University of South Alabama, Ouachita Baptist University, University of California at Riverside, University of Miami, University of Georgia, Tulane University, Mississippi State University, University of New Mexico, Teachers College of Columbia University, St. Augustine's College, University of Oklahoma, University of Pittsburgh, University of South Carolina, University of Tennessee, University of Virginia.

[52] Auburn University, University of South Alabama, University of California at Riverside, University of Georgia, Mississippi State University of New Mexico, University of Oklahoma, University of Pittsburgh, Universtiy of South Carolina, University of Tennessee, University of Texas, and the University of Virginia. Centers at private institutions are: Ouachita Baptist University, University of Miami, Tulane University, St. Augustine's College, Columbia University (Teachers College).

[53] St. Augustine's College.

[54] Interview with Dr. Morrill Hall, University of Georgia Desegregation Center Director.

[55] University of South Carolina, Columbia, S.C.

[56] University of South Alabama, Mobile, Ala.

[57] Auburn University, Auburn, Ala.

[58] Ouachita Baptist University, Arkadelphia, Ark.

[59] University of Miami, Coral Gables, Fla.

[60] University of Georgia, Athens, Ga.

[61] Tulane University, New Orleans, La.

[62] Mississippi State University, State College, Miss.

[63] St. Augustine's College, Raleigh, N.C.

[64] University of Oklahoma, Norman, Okla.

[65] University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, N. Mex.

[66] University of Texas, Austin, Tex.

[67] University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tenn.

[68] For example, at the time of the Commission visits to seven of the 15 (now 17) centers, the following situations prevailed. *Auburn University Center* had no blacks on its staff. (The Center Director as well as the Dean of the College of Education indicated that they had difficulty finding qualified blacks despite the fact that Tuskegee Institute and Alabama A&M, potential sources for "qualified blacks" were within 50 miles of Auburn.) The Centers at the *University of South Alabama, Georgia,* and *Tennessee* had no blacks in professional capacities (Tennessee had a black student assistant), the *University of South Carolina Center* had only one black serving in a professional capacity, and the *University of Miami Center* had only one black professional although the Center did have black student assistants. The single black professional was not located at the *Miami Center* but rather at its northern branch located at predominantly black *Florida A&M University* in Tallahassee. The University of New Mexico Center, on the other hand, had neither black nor white professional staff. Since the Commission's visits to the Centers, some changes have occurred both because of pressure from the Washington Title IV office and because of pressure from individual districts served which indicated that the Centers should practice what they preached. For example, there is one black professional staff member and there are two black professional assistants at Auburn University. There remain no black professional staff at the University of South Alabama. There are three professional staff members at Ouachita Baptist University. The university now has a black assistant director and several staff consultants who are black. Mississippi State University now has a black program specialist and a black assistant professor. At only five of the 17 universities does the minority student enrollment exceed 4 percent.

Centers existing at the end of 1971, all but two of the directors were white.[69] Until 1970, the bulk of staff members also were white. Furthermore, most directors in southern centers were products of segregated education in Southern or border State schools and gained most of their professional experience in segregated institutions as well.[70]

Center Programs

The two broad categories of programs which centers carry out have been training of school officials to help them adjust to and overcome problems incident to desegregation, and the provision of technical assistance, particularly in the form of preparing school desegregation plans. In addition, desegregation centers have been in a position to promote a climate of opinion favorable to school desegregation through their ability to affect the training of teachers at their universities' schools of education and by virtue of the prestige their universities enjoy in the area.

In carrying out these various functions, centers have been virtually free of control by the Office of Education. The amount of supervision that OE has exercised in the appointment of center staff, in the selection of consultants utilized by centers, and in the kind of program carried on, has been minimal. From the viewpoint of the centers, this has been welcome. As one center director told Commission staff: "One of the best aspects of the center is that so little control is or can be exercised from Washington or the regions by the Office of Education." [71] Failure of the Office of Education to exercise control, however, has led to a lack of overall focus to the center program and has resulted in inconsistency in approach, content, and objectives of the various centers.

Measured by efficiency in overall operation, lack of Office of Education control has represented a weakness, not a strength, to centers as functioning units of the Title IV program.

Training Programs

Training programs, or institutes, differ substantially in content and approach from center to center. To some extent, the differences reflect the philosophical orientations of personnel at the various centers. Some centers have felt that if training programs are to be of maximum effectiveness, they should be directed toward concrete issues specifically related to problems of desegregation. Such programs have been addressed to developing sensitivity among various school officials to problems of minority children and enhancing their awareness of the cultural values that minorities bring with them. Other centers have been convinced that problems of desegregation can best be resolved by approaching them indirectly. That is, in their view, the focus of training programs should be on overcoming educational disadvantage through improved curriculum and other aspects of compensatory education, while approaching problems of minorities obliquely through lectures on such subjects as anthropology and the history of blacks.[72]

An example of how the indirect approach operates can be obtained from an institute held from July 6–17, 1970 by the Consultative Center for Equal Educational Opportunity at the Oklahoma Center for Continuing

---

[69] The Center Director at St. Augustine's College, a predominantly black college, Dr. William A. Gaines, is black. Dr. John A. Aragon, the Director of the University of New Mexico Cultural Awareness Center, is Mexican American.

[70] For example, Dr. John S. Martin attended Alabama State institutions graduating from them in 1951, 1956, and 1959. A check of these institutions reveals, according to the President's office, that no black students were admitted prior to 1964. Dr. Martin is at the Auburn Center. He was in the Atlanta Public Schools from 1963-1969 when little desegregation had occurred in Atlanta.

Dr. Morrill Hall, Director of the University of Georgia Center, attended Emory University in 1941 and 1946 prior to desegregation of Emory. He received his doctorate from Florida State University in Tallahassee in 1956. The first black student was admitted to Florida State University in 1960–1961.

Dr. James L. McCullough received his bachelor's and master's degrees from Mississipi State University in 1949 and 1954 respectively. He received his doctorate from Mississippi State University in 1968. His first two degrees were obtained prior to the admission of black students, but in 1968 there were only .8 percent black students attending the university. The first black student was admitted in 1963.

Dr. Bash received his A.B., M.A., and Ed.D. degrees at the University of Virginia in 1949, 1954, and 1960. The first black was admitted to the University of Virginia to the school of law in 1951. However, in 1968 only .4 percent desegregation existed and in 1970 the institution was only 1.8 percent desegregated. This suggests that even today there is little desegregation. In addition, Bash's teaching experience was in segregated school systems, i.e., Pittsylvania County, Prince Edward County, and Charlottesville, Va.

[71] Interview with Gordon Foster, former Director, University of Miami Center, Miami, Fla. The former Director of the Auburn University Center also told Commission staff that there had been almost no contact with Washington-based Office of Education staff. What little contact with the Office of Education he had had, had been with the regional office.

[72] In some cases, there is substantial conflict even among the staff of the same center as to whether the direct or indirect approach should be utilized. One such center, visited by Commission staff, was the University of Oklahoma. In fact, the content of the various training programs at that center has depended upon the outlook and orientation of the particular staff members responsible for conducting the specific programs. To some extent, the views expressed by Oklahoma Center staff have broken down along racial lines—minorities wishing to use the direct, and whites the indirect, approach. According to a former staff member at the Oklahoma Center, minorities felt that the only way that training could be of value in overcoming the often unspoken fears of blacks and whites concerning desegregation was to bring them out in the open, and through frank discussions, lay them to rest. White staff members expressed fear that if a direct approach were undertaken, they would lose favor with local school districts, thereby damaging overall university relations and possibly undermining the university's financial support. Interviews with University of Oklahoma Desegregation Center staff. Interview with Dr. Wayman Shiver, former Oklahoma Desegregation Center staff.

Education at the University of Oklahoma in Norman, Oklahoma.

The Institute dealt with various aspects of human relations and social studies curriculum for Oklahoma high schools by focusing on such subject areas as loyalty, the "generation gap", and economic power. These topics in turn were only dimly related to the issues of desegregation through a round-about discussion in the classroom.

Thus, in the section dealing with loyalty, the discussion was concerned with different types of loyalty: To school, family, peers, community, country, religion and ethnicity.

The unit covering the "generation gap" was concerned with helping students to feel comfortable with the established code of society. The development of material was directed toward an awareness of what constitutes a generation gap, the value of communication where there is such a gap, and an explanation of why generation gaps exist.

In the section dealing with economic power, the discussion centered around change in economic power structure, power denied one because of what he is, and means by which to increase economic power.

The loyalty, generation gap, and economic power programming developed for teaching in social studies classes was concerned only tangentially with issues associated with desegregation. Thus in the section dealing with loyalty the only effort to reach issues related to desegregation was through a discussion of poems such as that by Carl Schurz:

> Our country, right or wrong. When right, to be kept right. When wrong, to be put right.

The evil of racial discrimination was among subjects raised. In considering the "generation gap", the different attitudes of the younger and older generations toward racial discrimination were explored. And in the section covering economic power the economic disadvantage of black people was discussed. The value of this institute for purposes of desegregation was limited.

As a staff coordinator of the program stated:

> The material utilized was good, but it would have been so much better to move directly to the issues concerned. A round-about approach to problems of race through the medium of loyalty or even economic power dilutes the thrust and the intended result of the program. We need to zero in on the problem of race and prejudice and avoid the circumlocutions.[73]

[73] Name withheld at the request of individual interviewed.

The direct approach, while carrying greater potential in theory for resolving problems of desegregation, has not been free from the weaknesses in practice which serve to lessen its effectiveness. Examples of center programs carried out at the Universities of South Carolina, New Mexico, and Texas, illustrate both the good and the bad of the direct approach.

A University of South Carolina center program, held in February 1970, provided an example of the direct approach. It involved an approximately equal number of black and white teachers and was concerned with "leadership development potential." Its primary purpose was to initiate sensitivity training. One such training institute observed by Commission staff members covered a 3-day period and featured "ice breakers": mixers, large group activities, and small group discussions aimed at stimulating positive changes in the participants' attitudes and behavior toward persons of another race. Major activities were usually directed by two leaders, one black and one white, for small groups evenly divided by race. Leaders at this training institute expressed great enthusiasm regarding the results obtained from this approach and the results obtained from it. On the basis of Commission staff observations, however, there was little support for this enthusiasm. For example, on the second morning of the training institute following a full day of integrated activity, generally conducted in small groups, Commission staff entered a general meeting room before the beginning of the day's session and found the participants rigidly segregated, blacks on one side of the room and whites on another. The few blacks and whites who were sitting close together had turned their backs on each other.

When the session began, the participants were divided into small groups evenly composed of blacks and whites. Each group was led in activities by one black and one white leader. Although the black and white leaders were presumably of coordinate status, each small group was known by the white leader's name, i.e., Holly's group, Conrad's group, and the like. All leadership functions were performed by whites, even those concerned with such minor tasks as providing general directions, calling the roll, and making announcements. The entire group perceived whites as the leaders of the institute.

Extraordinary emphasis was placed upon frankness at this institute. Assurances were given that no critical assessments made by the institute participants of the school systems or race relations generally would be used against individuals making them.[74] In a further

[74] Conrad Powell, University of South Carolina Desegregation Center staff.

effort to encourage candor, evaluations of the program were done nonverbally, by such means as evaluation checkoff forms filled in by participants or by acting out attitudes about the institute.[75] Nonetheless, the atmosphere at this training institute was one of less than candor.

One black consultant, in assessing the institute [she was a team leader], gave Commission staff her view of why the openness and frankness sought by the directors of the institute had not been evidenced either by institute staff or participants.[76] "The fact that all center personnel in attendance at the institute were white," she said, "inhibited black leaders." Whites, also, were less than open in their expression of their views. As the consultant put it: "Since white consultants realized that they would have to return to conservative communities in the State, they could not afford to be candid for fear that their positions in their home communities would be jeopardized. If the leaders could not afford to be candid," she said, "how could one expect participants, whose entire life styles had been forged within the framework of segregation, to benefit greatly from the institute program?" [77] The consultant further indicated that no follow-through was planned for the group as a whole. She summed up the net effect of this training institute: "A lot of money was being wasted." [78]

An institute held in 1970 under the auspices of the University of New Mexico Center provided another example of the direct approach.[79] The primary emphasis was on cultural awareness. A weekend institute visited by Commission staff covered material on problems experienced by minority children. Emphasis was placed on language and stereotypes of cultural groups. Two films provided the basis for discussion—"Black History, Lost, Stolen or Strayed" [80] and "Three Men of the Southwest." [81] Participants at the institute were teachers, principals, and superintendents from rural and "conservative" sections of the State.[82]

The program offered the positive benefits of presentations by consultants covering a variety of cultural issues, including anthropologically oriented lectures on American Indians indigenous to the area conducted at a museum where Indian villages were reproduced. There were also lectures on concepts necessary for effective teaching of the Spanish speaking child. There were no black or American Indian Center staff members present at the institute. Further, followup with participants in the program was not conducted because of time, staff, and monetary constraints.

Evaluations of this training institute were twofold: oral and written. For the oral evaluation, a "fish bowl" setting was established. Anyone wishing to comment was invited to the center of the circle of participants [fish bowl] to make his comments for the benefit of center staff [taping was done of criticisms] and participants alike. In addition, a written evaluation sheet was distributed. A further indirect assessment was provided through comments of individual participants interspersed throughout the institute program.[83]

The comments did not suggest increased sensitivity on the part of participants. For example, one comment repeated regularly was that there were "no problems in X school district because we love all our Indians and Mexicans."

This institute program was one weekend in duration and could not realistically be expected to bring about lasting changes in attitude or behavior. The variety of approaches to the issues dealt with—films, total group participation, human relations discussions, interracial and intercultural dining—were important strengths of the programs. The evident skills of some program directors, observed by Commission staff, were also a major plus. Despite these positive elements there was little indication of significant change in the attitudes of the participants.

An example of a more effective use of the direct approach was a Conference for Group Leaders held February 13–15, 1970 under the auspices of the Texas Educational Desegregation Technical Assistance Center of the University of Texas at Austin (TEDTAC).

The approach utilized by the TEDTAC Center included the use of several film sequences from the Lakemont Package developed by the University of Tennessee Desegregation Center. One film portrayed a teachers' lounge and a minority group teacher who was asking for advice about dealing with another teacher who had a Confederate symbol on her car. A second simulation film showed an irate white parent coming to

[75] Commission staff observation.

[76] Mrs. Abbie Jordan, Consultant to University of South Carolina Desegregation Center for the Sumter Institute program, February 1970.

[77] *Id.*

[78] *Id.*

[79] Regarding internal criticism made by institute staff that there were no permanent center staff members in attendance who were black, the response was that they, the center staff, were unable to find anyone "qualified." This despite the fact that the Center Director had previously been employed at a black institution (Benedict College) located in the same city as the Center in which he was working.

[80] Santa Fe Workshop Seminar for Selected New Mexico School Personnel.

[81] Originally developed for presentation on television by Xerox Corporation for a series entitled "In Black America."

[82] Prepared with Title IV funds with consultant assistance from Dr. Alexander Kite of the Santa Fe Museum and the University of Texas Desegregation Center.

[83] Observation by Commission staff.

school to complain that his elementary school daughter had been kissed by a black student in her class. A third film depicted a teacher seeking advice about handling the subject of the Civil War in a racially integrated classroom. Still another film entitled "The Isolated Child" showed a black child who had just transferred to a formerly white school. The child was isolated from the other children on the playground. The teacher was faced with the problem of deciding what to do when one group of children suggested the child join in the group while another said that maybe the child just didn't want to play.

In addition to these four simulation exercises, the program utilized inclusion processes in which responses of individuals to being rejected by the group and being welcomed within it were explored. Another issue examined was the relationship of teachers to children and vice versa (student bringing an apple to seek favor or teacher catering to upper class children).

The program observed by Commission staff was aimed at leadership training, that is, training of persons who would serve in consultant roles throughout Texas school systems in conjunction with staff members of the TEDTAC Center. Because of the racial and ethnic imbalance in Texas school districts, school systems were asked to send participants roughly representing the overall racial and ethnic composition of the district at the faculty level.

The simulations described above related to black-white issues. Another aspect of the program related to the Mexican American problems. A film entitled "Mexican Americans: The Invisible Minority," treated the various movements of the Mexican American: Brown Berets, lettuce and tomato strikes, the activities of Tijerina, Gonzalez, and Chavez, and a school boycott which resulted in a fired teacher's reinstatement.

Another film developed by TEDTAC, entitled "Grouped for Despair", portrayed the inability of white Anglo teachers to recognize the concerns of Mexican Americans by failing to comprehend pronunciation problems and labeling Mexican American children automatically as slow learners, low achievers, and the like. Further, the film revealed the lack of knowledge and concern of teachers for Mexican American children who had problems different from those of the overall student body.

Discussions following the films dealt with insensitivity and the inability of teachers to understand an ethnic or racial group other than their own. In addition, the group leaders were asked to grapple with questions of how the group viewing the film saw it, what kinds of long- and short-terms plans needed to be developed, and the value judgments which the film revealed.

Another film developed in conjunction with TEDTAC was "Three Men of the Southwest". In the film, an Indian, a Chicano, and a white Anglo were portrayed, all of whom held vicious stereotype images of each other and of blacks. The film showed the unfortunate effect of stereotyping, irrational prejudice, and name calling. It indicated the damage done to the individual and attempted to solidify groups by stressing the positive characteristics of each group.[84]

Leaders utilized "Incident Response Sheets" to stimulate participants to re-examine their own views and perceptions about the place of racial and ethnic minorities in American society. Questions were asked concerning black Americans such as: "Why do you think certain black figures were left out in history? What do you know of the development of black culture and black achievement in Africa before the beginnings of slavery in this country? Was Amos and Andy a harmful program?"

Questions directed toward Mexican American concerns included: "How do you feel about La Huelga, La Causa, La Raza, Cesar Chavez, and Reyes Tijerina? Do you agree with the narrator of the film that the Mexican American has been economically exploited?"

The leadership provided by the TEDTAC consultants and staff in exploring the materials shown and stimulating substantive participation from those present was a great strength of the program. Its pattern involved showing of the film, followed by discussion and inclusion-exclusion exercises. According to most participants, the program was effective in bringing about changes in the attitudes and thinking of those who took part. As one participating teacher said: "I thought I was already convinced about racial and ethnic equality but these sessions cleared out cobwebs which surprised me in still existing." [85]

Training institutes held in the South since the advent of centers differ in some important respects from the ones held earlier. For one thing, the early institutes generally held for longer periods—6 to 8 weeks or throughout a school semester—contrasted with institutes of only a few days' duration under center auspices. Another difference relates to the racial com-

[84] One serious flaw in the film was that it failed to correct the stereotyped picture of blacks. Another film, however, entitled "Black History, Lost Stolen or Strayed", which was presented did deal with issues relating to the universality of the stereotype, the omitted contributions of black Americans in virtually every recorded form of data preservation, and the destruction of black self image in a number of media.

[85] Mrs. Ida Fernandez, Group Leader Participant, Conference for Group Leaders, Feb. 13–15, 1970, Menger Hotel, San Antonio, sponsored by TEDTAC, The University of Texas at Austin.

position of institute participants. Now, as opposed to past practice, there is adherence to biracial requirements for institute participants.[86]

In one key respect, however, there is little difference between early and present training institutes: the attitudes and backgrounds of institute instructors generally remain the same. For example, a Title IV consultant of past institutes said of them:

> These institutes were just shot through with racism. Most instructors were trying to develop a program which would be appropriate for making kids conform to particular values and standards of achievement in terms of white middle class achievement.[87]

The consultant further characterized the attitude of those conducting past institutes as follows: "We don't want to do it, but the courts say we have to, so let's put the burden of proof on these kids to come up to our standards." [88]

Institutes of the present, conducted at centers, suffer from the same disability. In most cases, they are conducted by center staff, most of whom, as noted earlier, are products of segregated education in Southern or border State schools and have gained most of their professional experience in segregated institutions. Often, when center staff utilizes consultants, these are persons who also have been educated on a segregated basis, who have been employed in racially segregated school systems, and who have lived most of their lives in segregated environments. One center director, while conceding that this was true, sought to justify use of such persons as consultants:

> By utilizing a (nearby) superintendent as a consultant, no matter how limited he may be, we may be able to secure greater cooperation from him in the future in his own district.[89]

A staff member at another center indicated that utilization of faculty connected with the university at large was a "necessary face of life," whether or not such persons ever had evidenced knowledge or concern about desegregation.[90]

In his view, the insensitivity evidenced by those responsible for conduct of the institutes was a fatal flaw:

> A major component of a successful institute is the people who carry it on. There were a great many people involved in the institutes who had no real concern for human beings, except in the context of their own ethnocentric notions.[91]

One center staff member, formerly superintendent of a large metropolitan school district, was criticized openly when he met with personnel from his former district on grounds that he had been and continued to be against desegregation.[92] This same staff member was largely responsible for drawing the plan for Palm Beach County, Florida, which was repeatedly found unacceptable by Title VI staff of the Office for Civil Rights.[93]

Technical Assistance—Desegregation Plan Development

The development of desegregation plans is a significant aspect of the technical assistance role played by center personnel. The function of desegregation plan development was not generally a principal component of the center's activities until early 1969. Thereafter, courts increasingly required participation of HEW to assist school districts in complying with the court's orders. The former director of Title IV delegated responsibility for plan development in part to regional offices of Title IV and to personnel located at desegregation centers.[94]

One reason why center personnel, as well as Title IV staff, became involved in plan writing rather than Title VI staff was HEW's belief that desegregation plans prepared by educators would be more readily acceptable to Southern school administrators than those written by civil rights enforcers. However, neither compliance officials nor educators employed under the Title IV program proved satisfactory to school administrators when these persons worked on desegregation plan development.

Despite the fact that all center proposals contain requirements for producing desegregation plans, center

---

[86] For example, the University of South Carolina Desegregation Center and the University of New Mexico Cultural Awareness Center institutes, previously described, had approximately equal numbers of blacks and whites and Chicano and white Anglos participating. Institutes held by the University of Texas Center in several Texas locations in February 1970 also had substantial integration both at participant and staff levels.

[87] Dr. Paul I. Clifford, formerly Professor of Education, Atlanta University, Atlanta, Ga.

[88] *Id.*

[89] Interview with Gordon Foster, Director, University of Miami Center, Miami, Fla.

[90] Name withheld at the request of individual interviewed.

[91] Dr. Paul I. Clifford, former Professor of Education, Atlanta University, Atlanta, Ga.

[92] Dr. Joe Hall is now a member of the staff of the University of Miami Center but as recently as 1970–71, he was criticized by former colleagues and Title VI staff of the Office for Civil Rights for his activities at the desegregation center. Interview with Dr. Gordon Foster, former director of the University of Miami Center.

[93] Dewey Dodds, Office for Civil Rights, Atlanta Regional Education Branch Chief May 1970 (Title VI enforcement).

[94] Interview with Dr. Gregory Anrig, former Director of the Title IV program.

personnel often have resisted becoming involved in this aspect of their responsibilities. The principal reason has been the fear that they would be viewed as civil rights enforcers and thereby lose their effectiveness. One center official told Commission staff:

> I have spent a lot of time writing desegregation plans, but the center's assistance would be better directed towards getting people more responsible for implementation involved rather than center personnel.[95]

Another said:

> Drafting of desegregation plans is not an effective, productive area of responsibility, for school systems would rebel if we drew up plans, just as they have against the Office for Civil Rights (HEW—Title VI). We are reducing our effectiveness because we are having them desegregate in ways they do not want to which results in a failure to secure return visits to the districts.[96]

The desire of centers to avoid becoming involved in imposing desegregation plans on local school districts has been exhibited in a variety of ways. Thus one center [since abandoned] flatly refused to assist in the writing of desegregation plans.[97] Other centers have sought to avoid direct involvement by encouraging districts to develop their own plans. An official of one center explained that school systems and the community itself are more likely to carry through a plan which they themselves have developed.[98] Personnel at that center insist that the school district include a policy statement: "This board assumes legal responsibility to establish a unitary school system."[99] The official also explained that he favored "practical desegregation—legally acceptable, educationally sound, administratively feasible." He went on to say: "If a plan provides 'reasonable' desegregation, but not complete desegregation, which would not fit practical desegregation, then 'reasonable' will suffice."[100]

Centers also have limited their involvement to providing assistance to local school districts in their efforts to devise desegregation plans or to present alternative plans, leaving the selection to the local school district. These devices have had the effect of removing the centers from direct involvement in the development of desegregation plans, limiting their role to assisting school districts in drafting their plans.[101] The plans that result, he emphasized, are those of the school district, not the center.[102] The director of the University of Oklahoma Center explained: "We help school districts to design plans and we help to present alternatives."[103] A University of Virginia Center staff member explained to Commission staff his theory of the appropriate role for centers in devising desegregation plans:

> I have never felt that the Center's responsibility is plan writing. Rather, the Center should provide information to administrators so they can write plans. My suggestions have personally affected 11 or 12 desegregation plans in Virginia, but I have not actually written any. We push subtly and give advice, but the courts have to clear up de jure and de facto segregation questions, so we can't give advice on that.[104]

Still another problem relating to center involvement in devising desegregation plans has been lack of agreement on what constitutes an acceptable desegregation plan. Palm Beach County, Florida reflects a situation in which Miami Center personnel, Title IV staff, and Title VI staff were not readily able to come to agreement about the kind of plan to be drafted. Palm Beach County had received more than $200,000 in Title IV LEA funds during the years 1966 and 1967. During the period of these grants several Palm Beach Title IV staff members were devoting their time to developing a desegregation plan for the Palm Beach School District. In 1968, the county presented a proposed desegregation plan that would have left several all-black high schools and numerous all-black elementary schools. HEW rejected the plan as not in compliance with Title VI.

Following this rejection, administrative enforcement proceedings under Title VI were initiated against Palm Beach. The district was found to be not in compliance, but appealed to a higher level at HEW, where the matter rested until a new plan was submitted to the Department for approval. During the time the decision was on appeal, Palm Beach County officials agreed to have Miami Center staff review the high school seg-

[95] Ira Eyester, former University of Oklahoma Desegregation Center staff member.

[96] Dr. Wayne Shiver, former staff member, University of Oklahoma Desegregation Center.

[97] University of Southern Mississippi Desegregation Center, Hattiesburg, Miss.

[98] Interview with Allen Cleveland, former Assistant Superintendent of the Selma, Alabama Public Schools (1963-1968), formerly a field representative for the Auburn Center, and now Associate Director of the Auburn Center.

[99] *Id.*

[100] *Id.*

[101] Interview with Dr. William Gaines, Director, St. Augustine's Human Relations Center.

[102] *Id.*

[103] Dr. Joe Garrison, Director, University of Oklahoma Desegregation Center. Interview Feb. 9, 1970.

[104] Interview with Roger L. Long, Staff Specialist, University of Virginia Desegregation Center, Charlottesville, Va.

ment of their plan. The staff prepared a new plan for presentation to the county school board.

On June 4, 1969, Title VI staff visited the Miami Center to examine the high school plan developed by the center staff. Despite the fact that center personnel had drawn the plan, neither the center director nor Title VI staff approved the plan because it still retained all-black schools. It was agreed that the plan would be changed to meet Title VI objections.

Subsequently, another Title VI-Title IV Center staff meeting was held concerning Palm Beach, but an impasse occurred regarding the new plan's adequacy; the center director this time supported the plan drafters from the Miami Center. The Title IV Director came from Washington to mediate differences between the Office for Civil Rights (Title VI) and the Miami Center. The Washington Title IV Director agreed with the Title VI contention that the plan was unacceptable.

A new plan, which still left all-black schools, was finally accepted by Title VI Washington staff over the objections of regional Title VI staff, who indicated, among other reasons for not accepting the weak plan, "that the credibility of the Miami Center would be damaged and their further efforts undermined in other distrcts, and as well, the credibility of Title VI would be damaged." [105]

An onsite review was conducted by Title VI staff members following implementation of the plan. They concluded that the plan did not effectively eradicate the dual school system and was, therefore, unacceptable. Thereafter, center staff members once again were asked to develop a plan to be implemented in the 1970–71 school year. The third plan developed by Title IV Center staff did not differ materially from other plans previously developed by the center, for it again left several all-black schools on the high school level and numberous all-black schools on the elementary level. Title VI staff objected to this plan and because differences about the kind of plan to be implemented appeared irreconcilable, the Palm Beach County file was sent to Washington, once again for commencement of administrative enforcement proceedings.[106]

The recent posture of the Federal Government has had the effect of limiting center desegregation activities. For example, in 1969 an *ad hoc* Committee, consisting of high level representatives of HEW and the Department of Justice, was formed to review plans developed for presentation to local school districts and/or the courts.[107] The policies established by the *ad hoc* Committee have tended to reduce even further the effectiveness of center efforts in devising workable desegregation plans.

Shortly after its establishment, the Committee took the position that desegregation plans developed by Title IV personnel and center personnel should minimize busing and seek to avoid school assignments across geographical zones.[108] This policy resulted in the acceptance of plans that were clearly inadequate. Thus a plan for Caddo Parish [Shreveport], Louisiana, developed, in part, by the Tulane University Desegregation Center, which would have resulted in the elimination of all-black schools, was rejected by the Committee because it involved busing and noncontiguous zoning.[109] The Committee directed those responsible for developing the original plan to draw up a less radical one. The plan subsequently presented and accepted by the *ad hoc* Committee left 9,000 black children in segregated schools. It was rejected by the Federal district court.[110]

The impact of the policies of the *ad hoc* Committee has been to discourage effective desegregation plans generally. For example, a Title IV staff member in the Charlottesville, Virginia Regional Office of HEW, involved in drafting a desegregation plan for the Richmond, Virginia, schools, conceded to Commission staff that the plan was ineffective, but cited the policies of the *ad hoc* Committee as the reason why the plan had not been stronger.[111]

Despite the restrictive policies of the *ad hoc* Committee, some centers continued to attempt to develop viable desegregation plans, including the use of busing and noncontiguous zoning, which would completely eliminate the dual school system. In Volusia County, Florida, in 1969, the Miami Center collaborated with the Daytona Beach School Board in drawing up a desegregation plan. The district was already involved

---

[105] Michael Stolle, Professor of Education, University of Miami, formerly Director of the University of Miami Center.

[106] Before administrative proceedings were initiated, however, a private suit was filed against the Palm Beach County System. Both Title VI and Title IV Center staff testified, Title VI supporting a plan eliminating all-black schools and Title IV Center staff continuing to urge adoption of a plan which failed to eliminate all-black schools on the high school level. The plan finally ordered for high schools eliminated all-black high schools in Palm Beach County following the decision in *Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education* in April 1971. The plaintiff returned to court seeking further relief at the elementary school level.

[107] Among the members of the Committee are the Assistant Attorney General, Civil Rights Division, Department of Justice, the Director of HEW's Office for Civil Rights, the Director of HEW's Equal Educational Opportunities Program, the General Counsel of HEW, and a Special Assistant to the Secretary of HEW.

[108] Interview with Tob Kendrick, Senior Program Officer, Dallas Regional Office, Title IV.

[109] *Id.*

[110] *Id.*

[111] Interview with former HEW staff member, Charlottesville Regional Office.

in substantial busing unrelated to desegregation. A plan was developed involving two of the three all-black elementary schools [secondary schools were already desegregated] in cross-busing [whites to black schools and vice versa]. The third school was deemed inadequate because of its physical plant and was closed.

According to the center director, although the school district wished to implement the plan, the *ad hoc* Committee initially disapproved because it required too much busing.[112] Ultimately, however, the Committee approved the plan, largely because the school district wanted the plan, and thereafter it was presented to the court where it was accepted for implementation by the school district.[113]

The most recent and dramatic example of Federal policies restricting center activities in the area of desegregation plan development occurred earlier this year. In January 1972, Federal District Judge Robert C. McCrae, Jr. ordered the Memphis, Tennessee School System to eliminate the dual school system and wrote to the University of Miami Desegregation Center requesting assistance in the preparation of a desegregation plan. Such assistance previously had been requested of centers, as well as Title IV staff by Federal judges in cases involving school desegregation in such States as Louisiana, South Carolina, and Mississippi. In each case, the assistance had been provided.

Judge McCrae's request, however, received a different response. On January 6, 1972, Associate U.S. Commissioner of Education for Equal Educational Opportunity, Herman R. Goldberg, wrote to the director of the Miami Center prohibiting him from complying with the judge's request.[114] The Associate Commissioner's justification for this prohibition was that ". . . our authority to fund your activities is limited by the requirement [under Section 403 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964] that you act on behalf of duly constituted school authorities," not at the request of Federal *judges*.[115]

The Associate Commissioner also questioned the competence of personnel funded under Title IV to draw up desegregation plans, stating that Title IV expertise is limited to truly educational matters relating to desegregation. Thus, in his view, HEW's Division of Equal Educational Opportunity could best fulfill its role by offering assistance primarily in programmatic areas such as curriculum revision, teacher preparation and development programs and special community programs, rather than "logistics". He further emphasized the desirability of having persons indigenous to the area draw up specific desegregation plans.[116]

> It is also our view that a locally developed plan, both because it is likely to be more accurate and because it is locally developed, is more likely to win the broad community support which is critical to any plan's success.[117]

Goldberg's letter, if it stands as Title IV policy, would appear to resolve the continuing dispute over the appropriate role of Title IV in facilitating desegregation. Those who have contended that Title IV desegregation activities should be indirect, limited to assistance in improving the quality of education and avoidance of appearing in the role of civil rights enforcer, would appear to have won out over those who have maintained the view that only by dealing directly with problems of school desegregation, including active participation in desegregation plan development, can Title IV be of maximum effectiveness. After numerous cases in which desegregation centers, often reluctantly, have provided assistance to Federal courts in devising workable desegregation plans, this area of activity would appear to be at an end and centers would appear no longer to be available as a source of assistance to the courts unless directly requested by local educational agencies.

Testimony in Desegregation Litigation

Another important service that center personnel can provide is expert testimony in school desegregation litigation. Their experience and impartiality can be of significant assistance to the courts in determining the adequacy of particular desegregation plans. But just as centers have been reluctant to become deeply involved in preparing desegregation plans, they have also avoided testifying in desegregation lawsuits. The reasoning is the same: if they are placed in the position of testifying against a school district they will assume the role of civil rights enforcers and their relationship with that district will be impaired.

Most centers are reluctant to undertake any involvement in desegregation litigation on grounds that this would undermine their delicate relationship with

---

[112] Dr. Gordon Foster, Director, Miami Center.

[113] *Id.*

[114] Letter from Herman R. Goldberg, Associate Commissioner for Equal Educational Opportunity, to Dr. Josiah Hall, University of Miami Desegregation Center, Jan. 6, 1972.

[115] *Id.* (Emphasis added.)

[116] This point fails to acknowledge that Center Staff is usually indigenous to the area, though one questions why the University of Tennessee Center, located at Knoxville, was not requested to provide the assistance since it presumably was more "locally oriented".

[117] *Id.*

school districts and make their services unwelcome.[118] To the extent that centers are obliged to present testimony in such litigation, their preference is to do so in cases involving school desegregation in States other than the one in which they are located. An official of the University of Oklahoma Desegregation Center explained that by limiting participation in litigation in this way, the center could maintain its friendly relationship with school districts within its own State and avoid being cast in the role of civil rights enforcer.[119]

In some cases, officials of different desegregation centers have testified on opposite sides in desegregation litigation. Sometimes, the points of view expressed by the center officials appear to reflect the allegiance of their particular centers. For example, in 1970, in litigation involving the Norfolk, Virginia School System, the former director of the University of Miami Center testified on behalf of the plaintiffs, urging that the desegregation plan adopted in that city leave no all-black schools. The director of the University of Virginia Center, on the other hand, testified on behalf of the defendant school board, in support of a plan which would have left a substantial number of black students in all-black schools.[120]

Although the opposite positions taken by the two center officials may well have represented legitimate disagreement on how to accomplish desegregation most effectively, it is also of significance that the official testifying on behalf of a strong desegregation plan was out-of-State, while the official testifying in support of the weaker plan was from within the State. As the former Miami Center Director contended:

> . . . the plan [supported by the Virginia Center Director] would have left 75 percent of the black students in schools that the defendant admitted were bad. If you accept that premise, how do you decide which black students should be placed in bad schools?[121]

He concluded: "If a man is a director of a center and has to support that kind of position, he should not be a center director." [122]

Influence on the Climate of Opinion

In addition to specialized activities of desegregation centers, such as conducting training institutes and preparing desegregation plans, centers can play an important, though less formal, role in developing a climate of opinion favorable to school desegregation. There are at least two major ways in which the influence of centers can be brought to bear for this purpose. The first of these is through their ability to affect the training of teachers at the schools of education of their universities.

In early thinking about the role of desegregation centers, it was anticipated that center personnel would be able to influence the training of teachers throughout the State, which would result in a new teacher product, one sensitive to human relations problems likely to be encountered by minority and majority children in the new integrated environment. The Oklahoma Center has, in fact, been able to move other State institutions in developing curricula for their schools of education that will train future teachers to work effectively in integrated educational settings.[123] Most other centers, however, have been unsuccessful in this regard. Several deans at schools of education at universities which have desegregation centers told Commission staff that there have been no course changes brought about through the influence of university centers.[124] It is apparant that centers have had little impact in influencing the schools of education within their States. In fact, the flow of influence may well have been the reverse of that contemplated in that centers have made extensive use of consultants who are on the faculties of schools of education. Often these are persons who have little experience or knowledge of desegregation, but are steeped in the traditional attitudes and perceptions of schools of education.

Centers can also stimulate a climate of opinion favorable to school desegregation through employing the prestige of their universities in the area and in the State at-large. They have enjoyed some success along this line in small, rural school districts. In communities such as Enid, Oklahoma, and Tangipohoa Parish, Louisiana, according to the local school superintendents, the programs and the influence of the desegregation centers at the University of Oklahoma and Tulane University, respectively, have been major factors in generating a climate of opinion conducive to successful desegregation.[125]

In large metropolitan areas, however, where the problems are more varied and more complex, the impact of university centers has been negligible. In many cases, the assistance of centers, when offered,

[118] Interview with Wayne Shiver, University of Oklahoma Center.

[119] Interviews with Michael Stolle, former Director, University of Miami Center.

[120] *Id.*

[121] *Id.*

[122] *Id.*

[123] Interview with Dr. Glenn Snider, Professor of Education, University of Oklahoma, February 1970.

[124] Deans of the University of South Alabama, Auburn University, and University of Tennessee (Hadley, Pierce, Cohokus).

[125] Interviews with School Superintendents.

has been refused.[126] For example, the Mobile School System rejected university center services until ordered to accept educational expert assistance by the courts. Although assistance was offered to Oklahoma City, the school board of that city generally rejected assistance made by the Oklahoma Desegregation Center, as did Tulsa, another large city. Sometimes the reason given for rejecting center assistance is a lack of confidence in center personnel. Thus, an offer of assistance by the University of Virginia Center was rejected by the Charlottesville School Board on the grounds that center personnel either had worked in the school system or had gone to the university with people serving in the school system and, therefore, were no more expert than people in the school system.[127]

The Role of the Office of Education with Centers

As noted earlier, the Office of Education has been extremely permissive regarding the operation of centers. It has issued no directives indicating any coordinated approach to desegregation plan writing, nor has specific guidance been offered which would govern the types of institute seminars or workshop programs that should be developed. Further, no apparent attempt has been made to determine what programs have been most effective for various types of school systems.

In fact, there has been little contact between Title IV staff in Washington and the centers. In 1970, center directors complained that they had never heard of the person who was then the new Director of the Title IV program.[128] They also complained that there had been no effort made since the departure of Dr. Gregory Anrig to hold meetings to which center directors could come in order to pool information, learn new approaches, or get encouragement for program approaches, desegregation plan writing, or court testimony.

The Office of Education has also failed to give instructions or information concerning the kind of personnel most suitable for centers or even issue rules governing permissible activities of center employees. One center permitted staff members to operate a consulting service offering assistance, for profit, which the desegregation center was funded to provide.[129] Another center engaged consultants lacking the professional experience or background in human relations necessary to provide training in human relations or any kind of academic degree to offer the services has failed to insist upon consistency of approach, systematic provision of information to centers, and has failed to provide for systematic evaluations based upon defined and measurable guidelines for operation. The result, at best, has been an individual approach to a process which demands a national, coordinated strategy. At worst, the result has been to waste scarce resources on programs and institutions that contribute virtually nothing to the cause of school desegregation. Thus, with the single exception of the University of Southern Mississippi, the Office of Education has permitted centers which have failed to support current desegregation standards to remain in existence simply because they represent "a foot-in-the-door". The promise of desegregation centers as instruments for facilitating successful desegregation remains largely unredeemed.

[126] Staff interviews at the University of Oklahoma Desegregation Center, University of South Alabama, and the University of Virginia Center.

[127] Interview with Dr. James Bash, University of Virginia Desegregation Center.

[128] Dr. Joe Garrison, Dr. David Bjork, Dr. James Bash interviews. These men are center directors at University of Oklahoma, University of South Alabama, and the University of Virginia, respectively.

[129] Tulane University Center.

[130] Auburn University Center had virtually no experience in the field.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 accelerated the pace of school desegregation in the South. In the 8 years following its enactment school attendance patterns have changed substantially. In 1964 segregated schools in the South were the rule; today they are the exception. School segregation problems have not been eliminated. Indeed, they have spread to other parts of the Nation. Nevertheless, significant advances have been made in diminishing racial segregation required or authorized by State law.

The progress of school desegregation has come about largely through the exercise of the enforcement powers of the Federal Government, the threat of fund termination under Title VI of the 1964 legislation, and law suits filed by the Attorney General under Title IV of the same act. The 1964 law has another important provision bearing upon the problem of school segregation. This provision is not concerned with enforcement but with providing help for the schools. It does not seek to coerce school districts into desegregating, but to aid them in accomplishing it successfully. Under Title IV, the Federal Government offers technical and financial assistance to enable schools to adjust to an integrated system and to help reduce the problems that accompany such a change.

Title IV is an unique law compared with other laws concerned with equal rights. It is not prohibitory nor does it force changes in behavior. Its approach is basically conciliatory. It offers help in meeting problems that are attitudinal and emotional as well as behavioral. Through Title IV the opportunity has been presented to assure that the change from segregated to integrated education could be accomplished peacefully and successfully. The basic conclusion of this report is that the opportunity has largely been lost.

Many factors influence the way the desegregation process works, or whether it works at all. The vigor of the Federal Government's enforcement efforts, the political climate in the State or locality, the attitude of the school hierarchy, and the mood of the community are key elements in making this determination. Technical assistance under Title IV is only a part of the process, and it is unlikely that it alone can determine the success or failure of school desegregation in any community.

Controversy over the issue of school desegregation suggests not so much that Title IV has been unable to overcome the problems involved in desegregation, but that it has not really been tried. With few exceptions, funds expended under this title have been wasted, their objectives blurred, and their purposes thwarted.

The entities involved under the Title IV program represent key elements in the educational process. Each can contribute in different ways to achieving successful desegregation. In combination they can be powerful instruments for making it a reality.

First, the U.S. Office of Education, which has firm ties with State and local officials and educational institutions, establishes the guidelines governing the operation of the Title IV programs. It monitors the projects it funds to assure that they are accomplishing their purpose.

Second, local educational agencies (LEA's) operate at the community level and are directly faced with the problems at which Title IV is aimed. LEA's received grants from the Office of Education which pay for in-service training programs for teachers and other school personnel and for the employment of specialists to advise on how to meet problems of desegregation most effectively.

Third, State departments of education, which are in a position to influence and even set State policy on desegregation, can influence the climate of opinion within the State. State departments of education receive Title IV grants to provide technical assistance to school districts in the form of helping them develop plans for desegregation and cope with desegregation problems.

Fourth, colleges and universities provide a reservoir of technical knowledge and competence and frequently enjoy great prestige in the areas in which they are located. They receive grants from the Office of Education for the purpose of conducting training institutes for school districts.

Thus Title IV seeks to involve public and private institutions that are traditionally concerned with edu-

cation as active partners in the process of desegregation. Except in scattered instances, none of these institutions has carried out its role effectively. Consequently, Title IV has largely been a failure and the desegregation process has suffered.

The failure of Title IV begins at the Federal level and extends to every level of participation in the program. Lack of money is an obvious reason for its failure. At its peak the Title IV program received less than $20 million annually for national distribution. By the same token, HEW staff has never had adequate personnel to administer the program at the Federal level. It has not been possible for HEW to monitor Title IV activities to determine how well State and local programs are operating, or to weed out those programs that are nonproductive. As a result, HEW has not been in a position to know which programs are working well. In some instances, HEW has funded programs that should have been terminated, and has refused to continue programs that were proving effective.

The problem at the Federal level, however, has by no means been one solely of inadequate resources. Problems of low status and priority for Title IV in the HEW desegregation effort, of bureaucratic pressures, and of confusion regarding the purpose and approach of Title IV, have also served to blunt the force of the program and diminish its effectiveness.

In its early years, Title IV staff was detailed to work on Title VI enforcement. This was considered an activity of higher priority. When Title IV was separated from Title VI, it was not established as an independent unit reporting directly to the Commissioner of Education. It was made a subordinate unit in one of the bureaus of the Office of Education.

Title IV administrators, instead of husbanding the meager program funds available to them to assure that only the most promising proposals were funded, exhibited more concern with assuring that funds were dispersed as quickly as possible, regardless of the merits of the proposals for which the funds were sought. This was true in the early years when the patterns for operation of programs were being established. It reflected, in part, the view that the measure of a program's success is the quantitative one of how much money has been expended, rather than the qualitative one of what has been accomplished. As one Title IV if they would agree to say something about integration staff member phrased it: "We would support anything and desegregation."

More important is HEW's failure to provide guidelines governing the substantive operation of the program. The numerous task forces and committees established by the Department to consider standards and criteria for Title IV concerned themselves more with procedure than substance. In fact, HEW has never taken a clear position on what the scope and purpose of Title IV activities should be. Although there is general agreement that Title IV activities should complement those of Title VI, there has been no unanimity regarding how these complementary functions can best be carried out. Difference of opinion centers around two viewpoints: one, that Title IV can effectively promote desegregation by focusing on educational improvement; the other, that Title IV should be concerned with problems of desegregation and changes in attitudes and behavior.

Weaknesses in the administration of the Title IV program at the Federal level have been reflected in the programs carried out by State Title IV units, the local educational agencies, and the university desegregation centers. The directors of State Title IV units, whose job is to advise the State superintendent and participate actively in the formulation of State education policy, have often been placed several layers below the superintendent in the State education hierarchy and have rarely participated in discussions of policy. Title IV advisory specialists under the LEA program frequently have been physically isolated from other school officials and have had almost no contact with school superintendents. And institutions of higher education in which desegregation centers are located seldom have exhibited pride in the fact that they are actively involved in facilitating desegregation. On the contrary, through such means as physical location of center staff and failure to publicize the existence of the desegregation center, they have even shown a reluctance to be associated with this controversial issue.

Similarly, the lack of clear guidelines on substantive program operation has led to confusion at the State and local levels and has resulted in some programs and activities that are inappropriate to Title IV. For example, programs having nothing whatever to do with desegregation have been initiated with Title IV funds. Other programs, concerned with training teachers to cope with the problems incident to desegregation, have involved those who continue to teach in segregated schools. In some instances grants have been made to local educational agencies that exhibit no intention of desegregating. Terms of the grant contract have frequently been violated with impunity. Some State Title IV units, that are contractually obligated to assist in preparing desegregation plans, have refused to involve themselves in that activity. And decisions on whether

programs would be concerned with desegregation or education have been made, not on the basis of uniform guidelines, but on the particular viewpoint of individual grant recipients.

Hesitancy underlies the weaknesses in the program, and is common to every level of administration. Timid behavior has been justified on the grounds that Title IV can be a more effective instrument to facilitate desegregation by avoiding the appearance of civil rights enforcement or advocacy. Officials associated with the program have attempted to disassociate themselves from those involved in Title VI enforcement or those who go to court to require desegregation.

For example, local education agencies have almost always employed personnel indigenous to the area in implementing their programs. This is true of those which functioned well and those which functioned poorly. The employment of indigenous personnel has the advantage of avoiding the use of "outsiders" not familiar with the community and whom local residents might not trust. In practice, the disadvantages of using such personnel have proved formidable.

In the South Title IV personnel generally have been persons whose training and experience have been in a social climate and atmosphere in which racial segregation has been the accepted rule. Often, they have been apologists for the *status quo*. Further, these officials have been susceptible to intense political pressure from State or local officials unsympathetic to desegregation. This has caused them to be less than vigorous in carrying out their functions. They have also been subject to conflicts in allegiance, having to decide whether to follow Federal policy requiring desegregation or State policy opposing it. Despite their positions as Title IV officials, funded by the Federal Government, they have frequently resolved this conflict on the side of their State.

Another example of timidity that has pervaded the program is the reluctance of Title IV recipients to provide expert testimony on behalf of plaintiffs in desegregation litigation. They have expressed a preference for avoiding this activity completely or, if necessary, presenting testimony in litigation involving States other than their own. The effect is to deny to Federal judges the benefit of an expression of views by experts familiar with the particular locality and capable of contributing to the successful elimination of segregated schools.

Title IV recipients have gone to great lengths to avoid participation in the preparation of school desegregation plans. Some have flatly refused to participate in any way. Others have limited their participation to providing alternatives a local school board might select as appropriate. In this way, the Title IV recipients avoid the position of determining school desegregation plans imposed upon a local district.

The involvement of Title IV recipients, such as university desegregation centers, in the preparation of desegregation plans has often been at the request of Federal district courts that need expert help in devising means to elimiinate dual school systems. Until recently these requests have been honored. In January 1972, a significiant change in policy became evident. A Federal district court judge, considering ways to eliminate the dual school system in Memphis, Tennessee, requested the expert help of the University of Miami Desegregation Center. The Associate Commissioner of the U.S. Office of Education prohibited the center from providing the requested assistance on grounds that centers were authorized to provide such aid only to school personnel, not to Federal judges. If this policy stands, Federal courts will no longer have available to them the knowledge and experience of desegregation center personnel. The Commission on Civil Rights believes this is a serious error.

If Title IV has generally failed to accomplish its purpose of easing the path toward the desegregation of the schools, there have been instances in which it has been successful. In communities such as Muskogee, Oklahoma; New Albany, Mississippi; and Hoke County, North Carolina, LEA funds have been used effectively for achieving desegregation. It is not possible to isolate the basic elements or to weigh these elements in their importance in the desegregation process. Nor now is it possible to determine in any case how important Title IV really has been. In those communities where desegregation has been achieved, several common elements are evident that can be identified as important. In each case school administrators have been committed to desegregate the schools and make desegregation work. They have tried successfully to gain support for desegregation—or at least have neutralized the opposition—from local officials, civic groups, and business interests. In conducting programs under Title IV, efforts have been made to assure community participation not only by teachers, administrators, and other school officials, but also by parents, civic leaders, and other community representatives, acting as observers or consultants. The school officials have recognized the fears of the white and black community over the desegregation issue and have sought to alleviate them. Thus, conscious efforts have been made to improve the quality of education as desegregation proceeds. Moreover, the black community has

been actively involved in preparing for desegregation and assurances have been given—and honored—that black school officials would not be demoted following desegregation.

The Commission has found instances in which State Title IV units and university desegregation centers courageously resisted local opposition and political pressures to contribute effectively to the integration process. These instances, however, are the exception, not the rule.

The failure of Title IV can be attributed to weak administrative policy at the Federal level and timid operation of the program at the State and local levels. Perhaps the key to Title IV's lack of success has been undue reliance on local control and local autonomy. Since controversy surrounds the issue, the absence of Federal control or Federal guidelines has had the effect of dissipating the meager resources available under Title IV. Consequently, locally devised programs inevitably have been weak and ineffectual. One observer pinpointed the essential reason why Title IV has failed: "The . . . program is ineffective in that it requires a sick person to cure himself."

Compared with most Federal financial assistance programs, Title IV is small in size. Even if effectively administered, it could not, in itself, have resolved the many problems that are incident to the desegregation process. But Title IV could have made a substantial contribution. That it has not been effective has implications that are deeper than the mere failure of a minor Federal program.

The future of school desegregation is uncertain. Although there are examples of success in many parts of the Nation, many people—black and white—question whether integration can work. The chief contribution Title IV could have made would have been to establish the fact that desegregation *can* work, even in areas of the country most opposed to it. Under this program, prototypes of successful school desegregation communities could have been developed and the doubt about integration's value could have been quieted. Title IV has failed, and with it an opportunity to advance the Nation toward racial unity has been lost.

It is important not to learn the wrong lesson from the experience of Title IV. The lesson is not that desegregation cannot work or that the problems associated with it are so intractable as to defy our best efforts. The fact is that desegregation has worked, and communities thought to be most resistant have made the transition from segregation to integration. Substantial improvement in the quality of education offered to all children has been one result. Despite the general mismanagement of Title IV a number of programs funded under that law have been a key to the desegregation process.

The lesson of Title IV is that there is a reservoir of receptivity to desegregation which Federal aid, carefully structured and wisely used, can tap. If Federal policy is firm and unswerving in its dedication to the goal of complete desegregation, we can achieve it. In short, the Commission is convinced that the promise of Title IV is worth redeeming and that its policy and approach must be strengthened, not abandoned.

CHAPTER VI

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. *The Office of Education should establish clear guidelines governing the substantive operation of the Title IV program, including specific conditions of eligibility for prospective recipients.*
   a. *While projects concerned, in part, with educational problems and remedies should be considered eligible for funding under Title IV, it should be required that the primary emphasis of all projects must be to deal directly with problems of desegregation.*
   b. *All Title IV recipients should be required to demonstrate that their projects will be useful in actual desegregation situations.*
      (1) *Local Educational Agencies (LEA) should be required to show that their school systems already have desegregated or, as part of the grant agreement, that they will do so on or before commencement of the academic year following the grant.*
      (2) *University-based desegregation centers should require teachers and other school officials participating in training institutes to show that they are already operating in desegregated schools or that they will do so on or before commencement of the academic year immediately following participation in the institute.*
   c. *All Title IV recipients should be required to assure proportionate representation, on an integrated basis, of all relevant racial and ethnic groups, in the formulation and administration of projects and as participants.*
   d. *The Office of Education should develop criteria for evaluating grant applications that give a priority to the funding of "prototype" projects —those that involve school systems in which the likelihood that Title IV assistance will help make desegregation work is strongest—and should assure that the size and duration of the grant will be sufficient to facilitate success.*
   e. *The Office of Education should conduct an annual training institute with representatives of current and potential Title IV recipients (State departments of education, LEA's, and university desegregation centers) to assure a common understanding of objectives, strategies, and permissible activities.*

Discussion

Although there is general agreement that technical and financial assistance under Title IV should serve to complement enforcement efforts under Title VI, there is no clear understanding, within HEW or among the many Title IV recipients, as to how this function should be performed.

Some projects having little, if anything, to do with desegregation have been funded and renewed. Others have limited their use of Title IV funds to projects concerned only with compensatory education or educational improvements generally. To the extent that recipients have used Title IV for purposes of dealing directly with problems of desegregation, they have done so on their own, not as a result of clear guidelines from the Office of Education.

By the same token, Title IV funds to help overcome problems incident to desegregation have been provided to LEA's which maintained segregated schools and exhibited no intention of desegregating in the near future. Teachers and other school officials have freely participated in Title IV institutes concerned with training to teach in desegregated school environments, even though the school systems in which they have taught and to which they will return remain segregated.

In addition, Title IV projects frequently have operated on a racially exclusive basis, both with respect to administration and participation. Except in the relatively few cases in which recipients have been predominantly minority institutions, minority representation as administrators and participants usually has been minimal. Decisionmaking authority for the operation of projects, even when the staff has been integrated, almost invariably has been in the hands of white officials.

* The following recommendations, while specifically directed to the Title IV program, apply equally to other programs concerned with facilitating successful desegregation, such as the Emergency School Act, passed on June 23, 1972 as Title VII of the Education Amendments of 1972.

Further, the Office of Education, because of the limited funds available under Title IV, has made grants of small size and short duration to many recipients. Rather than limiting the number of grants to those recipients that show greatest promise of success and thereby developing "prototypes" of successful school desegregation, the Office of Education has administered Title IV as an "entitlement" program—giving something to many recipients—thereby diluting the impact of the Title IV program.

2. *Funds should be provided for systematic evaluations of all Title IV projects, either by a unit of the Office of Education independent of the Title IV office or by contract with private organizations. No application for refunding of a Title IV project should be approved prior to the performance of such an evaluation.*

Discussion

One of the major inadequacies in the administration of Title IV has been the lack of independent and systematic evaluation of funded projects. This has resulted in the renewal of projects that have been unproductive and the failure to renew projects that have proven successful. Wihout adequate resources for the performance of independent evaluations, the Office of Education has lacked information necessary to determine the worth of particular funded projects and has had to rely largely on occasional evaluations by recipients, which have tended to be self-serving, haphazard, and superficial.

3. *The Office of Education should reverse its policy prohibiting Title IV recipients, such as university-based desegregation centers, from honoring requests for assistance from courts in desegregation litigation, and require recipients to offer the full range of their knowledge and experience in helping to devise workable desegrgation plans.*

Discussion

Early this year, the Office of Education adopted a policy prohibiting university-based desegregation centers from honoring requests from Federal courts for assistance in formulating plans to end school desegregation. Requests for such assistance previously had been honored, with no objection from the Office of Education. The Office of Education's new policy, if continued, will serve to deny to the Federal judiciary the benefit of the knowledge and experience of Title IV recipients and will further discourage recipients, many of which already are reluctant to play an active role, from making a maximum contribution to the desegregation process.

4. *The Office of Education should give greater consideration to funding desegregation centers located at private institutions of higher education.*

Discussion

Most of the desegregation centers funded by the Office of Education have been located at State supported colleges and universities. Many of these centers have failed to assert a vigorous role under Title IV. Thus they have been reluctant to testify against local school districts in desegregation litigation or to participate in the preparation of school desegregation plans. One reason has been that their status as State supported institutions has made them wary of taking a strong stand on the politically sensitive subject of school desegregation and susceptible to external political pressures from State or local officials opposed to desegregation. Although private institutions are not entirely free from such political pressures, they are generally less subject to them than publicly supported colleges and universities. Commission investigations of the performance of various university-based desegregation centers suggest that private institutions, because of their greater freedom from external political pressure, generally have performed more effectively.

5. *The Office of Education should firmly enforce the contractual obligations of Title IV recipients, including withholding further payments under the contract and use of fund recovery mechanisms available to it.*

Discussion

Some Title IV recipients, such as State departments of education and university desegregation centers, have been reluctant to fulfill contractual obligations under their Title IV grants for fear of being placed in the position of "civil rights enforcers". Thus State Departments of Education have refused to become involved in developing desegregation plans, even though their grant contracts obligate them to do so. Desegregation centers also have sought to avoid becoming involved in preparation of desegregation plans or in testifying in school desegregation litigation, although these activities are in the nature of technical assistance, and as such, are part of their contractual responsibilities. While the reason for their reluctance—that they can be more effective as conciliators than enforcers—may be understandable, their refusal to become

involved in such activities has the effect of denying to courts and school districts alike, the benefit of their knowledge and expertise, in clear violation of their grant contracts. The Office of Education has overlooked such contract violations and, indeed, as noted above, in recent months has actually prohibited desegregation centers from providing assistance to the courts.

TABLE A—Title IV Grants to State Departments of Education (Southern States), FY 1965–1971

TABLE B1—Total Title IV Local Education Agency Grants by State, Fiscal Year, and Amount (All States with LEA's Receiving Grants)

TABLE B2—Total Title IV Local Education Agency Grants by State, Fiscal Year, and Amount (Southern and border States with LEA's Receiving Grants)

TABLE B3—Total Title IV Local Education Agency Grants by State, Fiscal Year, and Amount (States Other Than Southern and border States with LEA's Receiving Grants)

TABLE B4—Total Title IV Local Education Agency Grants by State, Local Education Agency, Fiscal Year, and Amount (All States with LEA's Receiving Grants)

TABLE C1—Title IV University Desegregation Centers

TABLE C2—Title IV University Desegregation Centers by State, Fiscal Year, and Funding Level (All States with Centers)

TABLE C3—Title IV University Desegregation Centers by State, Fiscal Year, and Funding Level (Southern and border States with Centers)

TABLE C4—Title IV University Desegregation Centers by State, Fiscal Year, and Funding Level (States Other Than Southern and Border States with Centers)

TABLE C5—Title IV University Desegregation Centers by State, Sponsor, Fiscal Year, and Funding Level (All States with Centers)

TABLE D1—Total Title IV Institute Project Grants by State and Fiscal Year (All States Receiving Grants)

TABLE D2—Total Title IV Institute Project Grants by State and Fiscal Year (States Visited by Commission Staff Receiving Grants)

TABLE D3—Total Title IV Institute Project Grants by State and Fiscal Year (Southern and border States Receiving Grants)

TABLE D4—Total Title IV Institute Project Grants by State and Fiscal Year (States Other Than Southern and border States Receiving Grants)

TABLE D5—Total Title IV Institute Project Grants by State, Sponsor, and Fiscal Year (All States Receiving Grants)

TABLE A 1

GRANTS TO STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION (Southern States) FY 1965-1971

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
ALABAMA	60,000		---	---	---	---	---	---	60,000
FLORIDA	855,542		225,000	---	134,820	179,808	98,823	103,980	113,112
GEORGIA	412,477		---	165,700	37,865	54,578	45,639	46,000	62,695
MISSISSIPPI	122,835		---	---	23,650	17,592	26,105	27,815	27,673
NORTH CAROLINA	259,590		---	---	---	---	94,890	62,350	102,350
OKLAHOMA **	154,263		---	---	---	---	44,263	50,000	60,000
SOUTH CAROLINA	379,394		---	---	79,622	70,987	71,285	75,000	82,500
TENNESSEE	314,463		22,078	61,870	---	62,965	46,050	54,000	67,500
TEXAS	225,255		---	---	---	40,538	43,933	50,000	90,784
VIRGINIA	77,528		---	---	---	---	---	---	77,528

* Alabama and Virginia did not have Title IV units until 1971. Arkansas and Louisana still do not have units.

** Oklahoma is a border state.

TABLE B 1-1

TOTAL TITLE IV LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY GRANTS BY STATE, FISCAL YEAR, AND AMOUNT (ALL STATES RECEIVING GRANTS)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
ALABAMA	1,838,741		40,000	306,265	73,150	223,111	145,099	659,276	391,840
ARIZONA	125,000		--	--	--	--	40,000	50,000	35,000
ARKANSAS	633,919		6,014	32,314	114,343	78,620	133,333	105,672	163,623
CALIFORNIA	2,432,752		--	139,103	177,303	263,729	349,664	706,731	796,222
COLORADO	17,000		--	--	--	--	--	--	17,000
CONNECTICUT	406,538		--	--	32,410	79,000	--	--	295,128
DELAWARE	58,130		--	--	--	--	--	--	58,130
D. C.	60,000		--	--	--	--	--	60,000	--
FLORIDA	2,551,750		882,695	428,517	381,605	177,716	44,402	294,628	342,187
GEORGIA	1,250,500		71,002	150,000	283,205	184,077	139,598	314,804	107,724
ILLINOIS	652,716		--	--	189,975	58,096	79,059	150,757	174,829
INDIANA	122,969		--	--	--	--	53,331	--	69,638
IOWA	31,954		--	--	--	--	--	--	31,954
KANSAS	45,500		--	--	--	--	--	--	45,500
KENTUCKY	693,992		392,019	7,600	--	86,720	--	128,743	78,820
LOUISIANA	1,282,035		--	40,000	--	62,162	56,498	681,334	442,041
MARYLAND	521,194		--	--	--	36,000	166,612	250,979	67,603

TABLE B 1-2

TOTAL TITLE IV LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY GRANTS BY STATE, FISCAL YEAR, AND AMOUNT (ALL STATES RECEIVING GRANTS)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
MASSACHUSETTS	197,310		130,124	--	--	--	--	67,186	--
MICHIGAN	888,975		224,950	11,065	88,140	--	69,231	234,459	261,130
MINNESOTA	189,974		--	--	--	120,824	--	--	69,150
MISSISSIPPI	720,008		--	209,590	41,035	88,800	53,866	122,548	204,169
MISSOURI	402,827		--	--	91,626	--	59,910	126,450	124,841
MONTANA	15,800		--	--	--	--	--	--	15,800
NEVADA	226,232		100,921	--	--	--	62,931	62,380	--
NEW JERSEY	355,053		50,265	--	--	81,448	9,325	37,072	176,943
NEW MEXICO	384,078		--	--	--	40,450	177,646	133,982	32,000
NEW YORK	793,380		--	212,035	26,533	117,443	--	100,200	337,169
NORTH CAROLINA	1,895,930		135,734	231,317	254,012	417,211	322,886	268,295	266,475
OHIO	339,987		--	--	--	--	70,000	93,126	176,861
OKLAHOMA	762,265		--	43,420	--	192,686	183,267	100,160	242,732
OREGON	148,839		--	--	--	--	--	89,437	59,402
PENNSYLVANIA	381,615		168,764	--	--	--	30,538	57,213	125,100
RHODE ISLAND	214,623		--	--	--	49,673	44,113	59,950	60,887
SOUTH CAROLINA	623,363		--	--	--	133,256	53,565	78,654	357,888
TENNESSEE	790,546		227,013	8,065	184,963	177,256	130,360	--	62,889

TABLE B 1-3

TOTAL TITLE IV LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY GRANTS BY STATE, FISCAL YEAR, AND AMOUNT (ALL STATES RECEIVING GRANTS)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
TEXAS	1,784,797		--	71,327	--	84,028	301,876	778,852	548,714
VIRGINIA	2,000,651		261,440	176,384	197,424	185,377	369,454	626,076	184,496
WASHINGTON	364,641		--	--	--	67,980	81,281	44,880	170,500
WEST VIRGINIA	14,037		--	--	--	--	--	--	14,037
TOTAL	26,319,621		2,690,941	2,067,092	2,135,724	3,005,663	3,227,845	6,483,934	6,608,422

TABLE B 2

TOTAL TITLE IV LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY GRANTS BY STATE, FISCAL YEAR, AND AMOUNT (Southern and Border States)

	TOTAL	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
ALABAMA	1,838,741	40,000	306,265	73,150	223,111	145,099	659,276	391,840
ARKANSAS	633,919	6,014	32,314	114,343	78,620	133,333	105,672	163,623
DELAWARE	58,130	--	--	--	--	--	--	58,130
DISTRICT OF COL.	60,000	--	--	--	--	--	60,000	--
FLORIDA	2,551,750	882,695	428,517	381,605	177,716	44,402	294,628	342,187
GEORGIA	1,250,500	71,002	150,000	283,205	184,077	139,598	314,894	107,724
KENTUCKY	603,922	392,019	7,690	--	86,720	--	128,743	78,820
LOUISIANA	1,282,035	--	40,000	--	62,162	56,498	681,334	442,041
MARYLAND	521,194	--	--	--	36,000	166,612	250,979	67,303
MISSISSIPPI	720,008	--	209,590	41,035	88,800	53,866	122,548	204,169
MISSOURI	402,827	--	--	91,626	--	59,910	126,450	124,841
NORTH CAROLINA	1,895,930	135,734	231,317	254,012	417,211	322,886	268,295	266,475
SOUTH CAROLINA	623,363	--	--	--	133,256	53,565	78,654	357,888
TENNESSEE	790,546	227,013	8,065	184,963	177,256	130,360	--	62,889
TEXAS	1,784,797	--	71,327	--	84,028	301,876	778,852	548,714
VIRGINIA	2,000,651	261,440	176,384	197,424	185,377	369,454	626,076	184,496
WEST VIRGINIA	14,037	--	--	--	--	--	--	14,037
TOTAL	17,122,420	2,015,917	1,661,469	1,621,363	1,934,334	1,977,459	4,496,401	3,415,477

TABLE B 3-1

TOTAL TITLE IV LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY GRANTS BY STATE, FISCAL YEAR, AND AMOUNT

(States Other Than Southern & Border States with Local Education Agencies Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
ARIZONA	125,000		--	--	--	--	40,000	50,000	35,000
CALIFORNIA	2,432,752		--	139,103	177,303	263,729	349,664	706,731	796,222
COLORADO	17,000		--	--	--	--	--	--	17,000
CONNECTICUT	406,538		--	--	32,410	79,000	--	--	295,128
ILLINOIS	652,716		--	--	189,975	58,096	79,059	150,757	174,829
INDIANA	122,969		--	--	--	--	53,331	--	69,638
IOWA	31,954		--	--	--	--	--	--	31,954
KANSAS	45,500		--	--	--	--	--	--	45,500
MASSACHUSETTS	197,310		130,124	--	--	--	--	67,186	--
MICHIGAN	888,975		224,950	11,065	88,140	--	69,231	234,459	261,130
MINNESOTA	189,974		--	--	--	120,824	--	--	69,150
MONTANA	15,800		--	--	--	--	--	--	15,800
NEVADA	226,232		100,921	--	--	--	62,931	62,380	--
NEW JERSEY	355,053		50,265	--	--	81,448	9,325	37,072	176,943
NEW MEXICO	384,078		--	--	--	40,450	177,646	133,982	32,000

TABLE B 3-2

TOTAL TITLE IV LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY GRANTS BY STATE, FISCAL YEAR, AND AMOUNT
(States Other Than Southern & Border States With Local Education Agencies Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
NEW YORK	793,380	--	212,035	26,533	117,443	--	100,200	337,169
OHIO	339,987	--	--	--	--	70,000	93,126	176,861
OKLAHOMA	762,265	--	43,420	--	192,686	183,267	100,160	242,732
OREGON	148,839	--	--	--	--	--	89,437	59,402
PENNSYLVANIA	381,615	168,764	--	--	--	30,538	57,213	125,100
RHODE ISLAND	214,623	--	--	--	49,673	44,113	59,950	60,887
WASHINGTON	364,641	--	--	--	67,980	81,281	44,880	170,500
TOTAL	9,097,201	675,024	405,623	514,361	1,071,329	1,250,386	1,987,533	3,192,945

TABLE B 4-1

TOTAL TITLE IV LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY GRANTS BY STATE, LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY, FISCAL YEAR, AND AMOUNT

(All States with Local Education Agencies Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Lauderdale Co. Bd of Ed	144,060		20,000	49,097	--	74,963	--	--	--
Tuscaloosa City Bd of Ed	20,000		20,000	--	--	--	--	--	--
Tuscaloosa Co. Bd of Ed	201,650		--	--	--	--	49,449	90,031	62,170
Troy City Bd of Ed	155,255		--	155,255	--	--	--	--	--
Anniston City Bd of Ed	123,433		--	20,283	73,150	--	--	30,000	--
Anniston Public Schools	35,000		--	--	--	--	--	35,000	--
Tuscumbia City Bd of Ed	154,886		--	21,518	--	60,250	73,118	--	--
Russellville City Bd of Ed	126,386		--	60,112	--	66,274	--	--	--

(cont.)

TOTAL TITLE IV LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY GRANTS BY STATE, LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY, FISCAL YEAR, AND AMOUNT

(All States with Local Education Agencies Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Florence Pub. Schs.	21,624		--	--	--	21,624	--	--	--
Andalusia City Bd of Ed	98,289		--	--	--	--	22,532	75,757	--
Auburn City Bd of Ed	30,000		--	--	--	--	--	30,000	--
Auburn City Schs	36,425		--	--	--	--	--	--	36,425
Birmingham City Bd of Ed	104,705		--	--	--	--	--	104,705	--
Demopolis City Bd of Ed	73,783		--	--	--	--	--	73,783	--
Florence City Bd of Ed	50,000		--	--	--	--	--	50,000	--
Phenix City Bd of Ed	34,000		--	--	--	--	--	34,000	--

ALABAMA (cont.)

TABLE B 4-3

TOTAL TITLE IV LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY GRANTS BY STATE, LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY, FISCAL YEAR, AND AMOUNT

(All States with Local Education Agencies Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Pike Co. Bd of Ed	96,000		--	--	--	--	--	96,000	--
Talladega City Schs.	40,000		--	--	--	--	--	40,000	--
Conecuh Co. Bd of Ed	37,000		--	--	--	--	--	--	37,000
Lee Co. Bd of Ed	35,000		--	--	--	--	--	--	35,000
Madison Co. Bd of Ed	65,268		--	--	--	--	--	--	65,268
Marion City Bd of Ed	21,792		--	--	--	--	--	--	21,792
Mobile Co. Public Schs.	62,801		--	--	--	--	--	--	62,801
Opelika City Bd of Ed	71,384		--	--	--	--	--	--	71,384
TOTAL	1,838,741		40,000	306,265	73,150	223,111	145,099	659,276	391,840

TABLE B 4-4

TOTAL TITLE IV LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY GRANTS BY STATE, LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY, FISCAL YEAR, AND AMOUNT

(All States with Local Education Agencies Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Mesa Pub. Schs.	125,000		--	--	--	--	40,000	50,000	35,000
TOTAL	125,000		--	--	--	--	40,000	50,000	35,000

TABLE B 4-5

TOTAL TITLE IV LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY GRANTS BY STATE, LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY, FISCAL YEAR, AND AMOUNT
(All States with Local Education Agencies Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Fayetteville Sch Bd	6,014		6,014	--	--	--	--	--	--
Little Rock Pub. Schs.	81,086		--	32,314	--	28,620	20,152	--	--
Hempstead Co. Bd of Ed	40,804		--	--	40,804	--	--	--	--
Pulaski Co. Spec. Sch. Dist.	49,752		--	--	49,752	--	--	--	--
Hampton Sch. Dist. No. 1	23,787		--	--	23,787	--	--	--	--
Monticello Sch. Dist.	50,000		--	--	--	50,000	--	--	--
Conway Pub.Schs.	80,985		--	--	--	--	31,000	49,985	--
Magnolia Sch. Dist. No.14	42,400		--	--	--	--	42,400	--	--
(cont.)									

TABLE B 4-6

TOTAL TITLE IV LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY GRANTS BY STATE, LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY, FISCAL YEAR, AND AMOUNT
(All States with Local Education Agencies Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Lakeside Pub. Sch.	39,781		--	--	--	--	39,781	--	--
Lakeside Sch. Dist. No.1	14,556		--	--	--	--	--	14,556	--
Camden Sch.Dist. No.35	41,131		--	--	--	--	--	41,131	--
Camden Sch.Dist.	18,500		--	--	--	--	--	--	18,500
El Dorado ISD-15	30,828		--	--	--	--	--	--	30,828
Eudora Sch. Dist.	35,291		--	--	--	--	--	--	35,291
Pine Bluff Pub Schs.	59,000		--	--	--	--	--	--	59,000
Wynne Sch.Dist. No.9	20,004		--	--	--	--	--	--	20,004
TOTAL	633,919		6,014	32,314	114,343	78,620	133,333	105,672	163,623

TOTAL TITLE IV LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY GRANTS BY STATE, LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY, FISCAL YEAR, AND AMOUNT

(All States with Local Education Agencies Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Los Angeles City Unif. Sch. Dist.	137,473		--	109,103	5,370	--	23,000	--	--
Oakland Unif.Sch. Dist.	30,000		--	30,000	--	--	--	--	--
Riverside Unif. Sch.Dist.	99,544		--	--	99,544	--	--	--	--
Sacramento Unif. Sch.Dist.	139,891		--	--	72,389	67,502	--	--	--
Berkeley Unf. Sch. Dist.	232,593		--	--	--	96,469	80,069	56,055	--
San Mateo Sch. Dist.	118,592		--	--	--	58,943	59,649	--	--
Richmond Unif. Sch.Dist.	120,381		--	--	--	40,815	79,566	--	--
Pittsburg Sch. Dist.	170,645		--	--	--	--	56,004	57,801	56,840
Redlands Sch. Dist.	152,464		--	--	--	--	51,376	61,088	40,000
(cont.)									

TOTAL TITLE IV LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY GRANTS BY STATE, LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY, FISCAL YEAR, AND AMOUNT
(All States with Local Education Agencies Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Los Angeles Co.	64,250		--	--	--	--	--	30,500	33,750
Merced City Sch Dist.	135,716		--	--	--	--	--	55,000	80,716
Monrovia Unif. Sch.Dist.	107,400		--	--	--	--	--	53,700	53,700
New Haven Unif. Sch. Dist.	126,700		--	--	--	--	--	66,700	60,000
Pasadena Unif. Sch.Dist.	197,497		--	--	--	--	--	97,500	99,997
Perris Unif. Sch. Dist.	80,914		--	--	--	--	--	45,914	35,000
San Francisco Unif.Sch.Dist.	288,566		--	--	--	--	--	138,659	149,907
Hanford Joint Union High	49,360		--	--	--	--	--	--	49,360
Inglewood Unif. Sch. Dist.	61,292		--	--	--	--	--	--	61,292
(cont.)									

CALIFORNIA (cont.)

TABLE B 4-9

TOTAL TITLE IV LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY GRANTS BY STATE, LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY, FISCAL YEAR, AND AMOUNT

(All States with Local Education Agencies Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
San Mateo Elem. Sch.Dist.	43,814		--	--	--	--	--	43,814	--
Sequoia Union Sch. Dist.	75,660		--	--	--	--	--	--	75,660
TOTAL	2,432,752		--	139,103	177,303	263,729	349,664	706,731	796,222

TOTAL TITLE IV LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY GRANTS BY STATE, LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY, FISCAL YEAR, AND AMOUNT

(All States with Local Education Agencies Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
East Otero Sch. Dist. R-1	17,000		--	--	--	--	--	--	17,000
TOTAL	17,000		--	--	--	--	--	--	17,000

CONNECTICUT

TABLE B 4-11

TOTAL TITLE IV LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY GRANTS BY STATE, LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY, FISCAL YEAR, AND AMOUNT
(All States with Local Education Agencies Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Norwalk Bd of Ed	32,410		--	--	32,410	--	--	--	--
Hartford City Bd of Ed	79,000		--	--	--	79,000	--	--	--
Bloomfield Bd of Ed	129,755		--	--	--	--	--	--	129,755
Hamden Bd of Ed	49,614		--	--	--	--	--	--	49,614
Stamford Bd of Ed	115,759		--	--	--	--	--	--	115,759
TOTAL	406,538		--	--	32,410	79,000	--	--	295,128

DELAWARE

TABLE B 4-12

TOTAL TITLE IV LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY GRANTS BY STATE, LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY, FISCAL YEAR, AND AMOUNT

(All States with Local Education Agencies Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Appoquinimink Sch.Dist.	28,130		--	--	--	--	--	--	28,130
Wilmington Bd. of Ed	30,000		--	--	--	--	--	--	30,000
TOTAL	58,130		--	--	--	--	--	--	58,130

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

TABLE B 4-13

TOTAL TITLE IV LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY GRANTS BY STATE, LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY, FISCAL YEAR, AND AMOUNT

(All States with Local Education Agencies Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Wash., D.C. Pub. Schs.	60,000		--	--	--	--	--	60,000	--
TOTAL	60,000		--	--	--	--	--	60,000	--

TABLE B 4-14

FLORIDA

TOTAL TITLE IV LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY GRANTS BY STATE, LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY, FISCAL YEAR, AND AMOUNT
(All States with Local Education Agencies Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Palm Beach Co. Bd of Pub. Inst.	213,026		--	135,295	77,731	--	--	--	--
Polk Co. Bd of Pub. Inst.	24,162		--	24,162	--	--	--	--	--
Broward Co. Bd of Pub.Inst.	183,715		--	183,715	--	--	--	--	--
Manatee Co. of Pub.Schs.	178,592			68,782	29,825	79,985	--	--	--
Glades Co. Bd of Pub.Inst.	23,155		--	16,563	6,592	--	--	--	--
Volusia Co. Bd of Pub.Inst.	585,541		350,000	--	160,074	75,467	--	--	--
St. Lucie Co. Pub. Sch.	97,109		--	--	66,552	--	30,557	--	--
Lee Co. Gd. of Pub.Inst.	40,831		--	--	40,831	--	--	--	--
(cont.)									

FLORIDA (cont.)

TABLE B 4-15

TOTAL TITLE IV LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY GRANTS BY STATE, LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY, FISCAL YEAR, AND AMOUNT
(All States with Local Education Agencies Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Dade Co. Sch. Bd.	546,313		300,732	--	--	--	--	75,600	169,981
Hillsborough Co. Pub.Schs.	69,348		69,348	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hillsborough Co. Sch. Supt.	12,129		--	--	--	--	--	--	12,129
Hillsborough Co. Sch. Bd. of Ed.	67,528		--	--	--	--	--	67,528	--
Brevard Co. Bd of Pub.Inst.	198,724		162,615	--	--	22,264	13,845	--	--
Alachua Co. Sch. Bd.	96,500		--	--	--	--	--	56,500	40,000
Escambia Co.Sch. Bd.	39,764		--	--	--	--	--	--	39,764

(cont.)

TABLE B 4-16

TOTAL TITLE IV LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY GRANTS BY STATE, LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY, FISCAL YEAR, AND AMOUNT

(All States with Local Education Agencies Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Duval Co. Bd of Ed	95,000		--	--	--	--	--	95,000	--
Polk Co. Sch. Bd.	80,313		--	--	--	--	--	--	80,313
TOTAL	2,551,750		882,695	428,517	381,605	177,716	44,402	294,628	342,187

GEORGIA

TABLE B 4-17

TOTAL TITLE IV LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY GRANTS BY STATE, LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY, FISCAL YEAR, AND AMOUNT

(All States with Local Education Agencies Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Atlanta Bd of Ed	130,608		71,002	--	--	59,606	--	--	--
Atlanta Pub.Schs	50,227		--	--	--	--	--	50,227	--
City of Atlanta Bd of Ed	325,000		--	150,000	175,000	--	--	--	--
Cook Co. Bd of Ed	59,128		--	--	36,055	--	--	23,073	--
Clayton Co. Bd of Ed	72,150		--	--	72,150	--	--	--	--
Chattooga Co. Bd of Ed	68,887		--	--	--	68,887	--	--	--
Madison Bd of Ed	55,584		--	--	--	55,584	--	--	--
Rockdale Co. Bd of Ed	71,660		--	--	--	--	71,660	--	--

(cont.)

TOTAL TITLE IV LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY GRANTS BY STATE, LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY, FISCAL YEAR, AND AMOUNT

(All States with Local Education Agencies Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Twiggs Co. Bd of Ed	24,898		--	--	--	--	24,898	--	--
Stephens Co. Bd of Ed	43,040		--	--	--	--	43,040	--	--
Butts Co. Bd of Ed	29,540		--	--	--	--	--	29,540	--
Griffin-Spalding Co. Bd of Ed	40,000		--	--	--	--	--	40,000	--
LaGrange-Troup Co. Bd of Ed	46,790		--	--	--	--	--	46,790	--
Laurens Co. Bd of Ed	40,000		--	--	--	--	--	40,000	--
Stephens Co. Bd of Ed	10,000		--	--	--	--	--	10,000	--
Dift Co. Bd of Ed	29,930		--	--	--	--	--	29,930	--

(cont.)

TOTAL TITLE IV LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY GRANTS BY STATE, LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY, FISCAL YEAR, AND AMOUNT

(All States with Local Education Agencies Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Waycross Pub. Schs.	45,334		--	--	--	--	--	45,334	--
Baldwin Co. Bd of Ed	19,976		--	--	--	--	--	--	19,976
Crisp Co. Bd of Ed	27,277		--	--	--	--	--	--	27,277
Dougherty Co. Bd of Ed	51,141		--	--	--	--	--	--	51,141
Hawkinsville City Bd of Ed	9,330		--	--	--	--	--	--	9,330
TOTAL	1,250,500		71,002	150,000	283,205	184,077	139,598	314,894	107,724

TOTAL TITLE IV LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY GRANTS BY STATE, LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY, FISCAL YEAR, AND AMOUNT

(All States with Local Education Agencies Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Alexander Co. Intermediate Sch. Dist.	15,925		--	--	15,925	--	--	--	--
Community Consol. Sch. Dist.-65	119,840		--	--	119,840	--	--	--	--
Chicago Bd of Ed	54,210		--	--	54,210	--	--	--	--
Evanston Pub. Schs.	58,096		--	--	--	58,096	--	--	--
Carbondale Elem. Sch Dist.	17,610		--	--	--	--	17,610	--	--
South Holland Sch.Dist.-1	44,959		--	--	--	--	44,959	--	--
Peoria Pub. Schs.	83,253		--	--	--	--	16,490	--	66,763
South Holland Elem.Sch.Dist. -151	119,028		--	--	--	--	--	73,317	45,711

(cont.)

ILLINOIS (cont.)

TABLE B 4-21

TOTAL TITLE IV LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY GRANTS BY STATE, LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY, FISCAL YEAR, AND AMOUNT

(All States with Local Education Agencies Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Kankakee Sch. Dist.-3	77,440		--	--	--	--	--	77,440	--
Hammond Pub. Schs.	62,355		--	--	--	--	--	--	62,355
TOTAL	652,716		--	--	139,975	58,096	79,059	150,757	174,829

TOTAL TITLE IV LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY GRANTS BY STATE, LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY, FISCAL YEAR, AND AMOUNT

(All States with Local Education Agencies Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Schs., City of	53,331		--	--	--	--	53,331	--	--
Indpls. Bd of Ed	69,638		--	--	--	--	--	--	69,638
TOTAL	122,969		--	--	--	--	53,331	--	69,638

TABLE B 4-23

IOWA

TOTAL TITLE IV LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY GRANTS BY STATE, LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY, FISCAL YEAR, AND AMOUNT

(All States with Local Education Agencies Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Sioux City Comm. Sch.Dist.	31,954		--	--	--	--	--	--	31,954
TOTAL	31,954		--	--	--	--	--	--	31,954

TOTAL TITLE IV LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY GRANTS BY STATE, LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY, FISCAL YEAR, AND AMOUNT
(All States with Local Education Agencies Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Lawrence Unif Sch.Dist.	45,500		--	--	--	--	--	--	45,500
TOTAL	45,500		--	--	--	--	--	--	45,500

TABLE B 4-25

TOTAL TITLE IV LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY GRANTS BY STATE, LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY, FISCAL YEAR, AND AMOUNT
(All States with Local Education Agencies Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Henderson Co. & City Bd of Ed	53,950		53,950	--	--	--	--	--	--
Hopkinsville Ind. Sch.Dist.	134,324		134,324	--	--	--	--	--	--
Christian Co. Bd of Ed	96,600		96,600	--	--	--	--	--	--
Lexington Bd of Ed	107,145		107,145	--	--	--	--	--	--
Caldwell Co. Bd of Ed	7,690		--	7,690	--	--	--	--	--
Louisville Pub. Schs.	157,264		--	--	--	86,720	--	70,544	--
Bowling Green Pub.Schs.	23,402		--	--	--	--	--	--	23,402

(cont.)

TABLE B 4-26

KENTUCKY (cont.)

TOTAL TITLE IV LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY GRANTS BY STATE, LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY, FISCAL YEAR, AND AMOUNT

(All States with Local Education Agencies Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Fulton Co. Bd of Ed	30,139		--	--	--	--	--	15,068	15,071
Covington Ind. Bd of Ed	16,420		--	--	--	--	--	16,420	--
Jefferson Co. Schs.	53,428		--	--	--	--	--	26,711	26,717
Simpson Co. Bd of Ed	13,630		--	--	--	--	--	--	13,630
TOTAL	693,992		392,019	7,690	--	86,720	--	128,743	78,820

TOTAL TITLE IV LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY GRANTS BY STATE, LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY, FISCAL YEAR, AND AMOUNT
(All States with Local Education Agencies Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Orleans Parish Sch.Dist.	102,162		--	40,000	--	62,162	--	--	--
Terrebonne Parish Sch. Bd.	27,998		--	--	--	--	27,998	--	--
La Fourch Parish Sch. Bd.	28,500		--	--	--	--	28,500	--	--
Acadia Parish Sch.Bd.	39,998		--	--	--	--	--	39,998	--
Bossier Parish Sch.Dist.	62,250		--	--	--	--	--	62,250	--
Calcasieu Parish Sch.Dist.	45,000		--	--	--	--	--	45,000	--
East Baton Rouge Parish Sch.Bd.	142,775		--	--	--	--	--	142,775	--
East Feliciana Parish Sch.Bd.	50,870		--	--	--	--	--	50,870	--
(cont.)									

TOTAL TITLE IV LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY GRANTS BY STATE, LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY, FISCAL YEAR, AND AMOUNT

(All States with Local Education Agencies Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Lincoln Parish Sch.Dist.	66,200		--	--	--	--	--	66,200	--
Morehouse Parish Sch.Dist.	20,908		--	--	--	--	--	20,908	--
Ouachita Parish Sch.Dist.	51,000		--	--	--	--	--	51,000	--
St. Landry Parish Sch. Bd.	67,250		--	--	--	--	--	67,250	--
St. Martin Parish Sch. Bd.	104,00		--	--	--	--	--	60,000	44,000
Vermilion Parish Sch.Bd.	36,483		--	--	--	--	--	36,483	--
West Carroll Parish Sch. Dist.	38,600		--	--	--	--	--	38,600	--
Ascension Parish Sch.Bd.	46,922		--	--	--	--	--	--	46,922
Caddo Parish Sch.Bd.	150,000		--	--	--	--	--	--	150,000
(cont.)									

TOTAL TITLE IV LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY GRANTS BY STATE, LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY, FISCAL YEAR, AND AMOUNT

(All States with Local Education Agencies Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
State Industrial Sch.-Div. of Dept. of Corrections	93,970	--	--	--	--	--	--	93,970
St. James Parish Sch.Bd.	57,610	--	--	--	--	--	--	57,610
St. John Baptist Parish	16,511	--	--	--	--	--	--	16,511
West Feliciana Parish	33,028	--	--	--	--	--	--	33,028
TOTAL	1,282,035	--	40,000	--	62,162	56,498	681,334	442,041

MARYLAND

TABLE B 4-30

TOTAL TITLE IV LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY GRANTS BY STATE, LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY, FISCAL YEAR, AND AMOUNT

(All States with Local Education Agencies Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Calvert Co. Sch. Dist.	36,000		--	--	--	36,000	--	--	--
Charles Co. Bd. of Ed.	46,638		--	--	--	--	46,638	--	--
Kent Co. Bd of Ed	29,499		--	--	--	--	29,499	--	--
Anne Arundel Co. Bd of Ed	72,294		--	--	--	--	30,475	41,819	--
Baltimore City Pub.Schs.	130,220		--	--	--	--	60,000	43,015	27,205
Calvert Co. Bd. of Ed.	51,365		--	--	--	--	--	51,365	--
Dorchester Co. Bd. of Ed.	53,796		--	--	--	--	--	26,398	27,398
Kent Co. Bd of Ed	19,998		--	--	--	--	--	19,998	--
(cont.)									

TOTAL TITLE IV LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY GRANTS BY STATE, LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY, FISCAL YEAR, AND AMOUNT
(All States with Local Education Agencies Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Prince Georges Co.Pub.Schs.	50,000		--	--	--	--	--	50,000	--
St. Mary's Co. Bd of Ed	18,284		--	--	--	--	--	18,284	--
Somerset Co. Sch.Bd.	9,000		--	--	--	--	--	--	9,000
St. Mary's Co. Sch. Bd.	4,100		--	--	--	--	--	--	4,000
TOTAL	521,194		--	--	--	36,000	166,612	250,979	67,603

TOTAL TITLE IV LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY GRANTS BY STATE, LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY, FISCAL YEAR, AND AMOUNT
(All States with Local Education Agencies Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Commonwealth of Mass., Boston	130,124		130,124	--	--	--	--	--	--
Springfield Sch. Dist.	67,186		--	--	--	--	--	67,186	--
TOTAL	197,310		130,124	--	--	--	--	67,186	--

TOTAL TITLE IV LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY GRANTS BY STATE, LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY, FISCAL YEAR, AND AMOUNT

(All States with Local Education Agencies Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Wayne Co. Intermediate Sch. Dist.	313,090		224,950	--	88,140	--	--	--	--
Ypsilanti Sch. Dist.	11,065		--	11,065	--	--	--	--	--
Grand Rapids Pub Schs.	144,487		--	--	--	--	69,231	75,256	--
Kalamazoo Pub. Schs.	136,396		--	--	--	--	--	84,878	51,518
Lansing Sch.Dist.	74,325		--	--	--	--	--	74,325	--
Baldwin Community Sch.Dist.	49,425		--	--	--	--	--	--	49,425
(cont.)									

MICHIGAN (cont.)

TABLE B 4-34

TOTAL TITLE IV LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY GRANTS BY STATE, LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY, FISCAL YEAR, AND AMOUNT
(All States with Local Education Agencies Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Detroit Pub.Schs.	110,187		--	--	--	--	--	--	110,187
Jackson Pub. Schs.	50,000		--	--	--	--	--	--	50,000
TOTAL	888,975		224,950	11,065	88,140	--	69,231	234,459	261,130

TOTAL TITLE IV LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY GRANTS BY STATE, LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY, FISCAL YEAR, AND AMOUNT
(All States with Local Education Agencies Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
St. Paul Pub.Schs.	33,324		--	--	--	33,324	--	--	--
Minneapolis Spec Sch.Dist.	87,500		--	--	--	87,500	--	--	--
Independent Sch. Dist.-309	69,150		--	--	--	--	--	--	69,150
TOTAL	189,974		--	--	--	120,824	--	--	69,150

TOTAL TITLE IV LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY GRANTS BY STATE, LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY, FISCAL YEAR, AND AMOUNT
(All States with Local Education Agencies Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Biloxi Mun. Sch. Dist.	209,590		--	209,590	--	--	--	--	--
McComb Mun. Sep. Sch. Dist.	94,901		--	--	41,035	--	53,866	--	--
New Albany Sep. Sch.Dist.	135,840		--	--	--	88,800	--	47,040	--
Corinth Mun. Sep. Sch.Dist.	10,000		--	--	--	--	--	10,000	--
South Pike Consol. Sch.Dist.	21,475		--	--	--	--	--	21,475	--
Western Line Consol. Sch.Dist.	44,033		--	--	--	--	--	44,033	--
Baldwyn Pub.Schs.	29,630		--	--	--	--	--	--	29,630
(cont.)									

TOTAL TITLE IV LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY GRANTS BY STATE, LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY, FISCAL YEAR, AND AMOUNT

(All States with Local Education Agencies Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Bolivar Co. Sch. Dist.-1	47,200		--	--	--	--	--	--	47,200
Greenwood Municipal Sep.Sch.Dist.	42,000		--	--	--	--	--	--	42,000
Indianola Mun. Sep.Sch.Dist.	15,075		--	--	--	--	--	--	15,075
Lafayette Co. Bd of Ed	19,709		--	--	--	--	--	--	19,709
Lauderdale	19,600		--	--	--	--	--	--	19,600
Simpson Co. Pub. Schs.	30,955		--	--	--	--	--	--	30,955
TOTAL	720,008		--	209,590	41,035	88,800	53,866	122,548	204,169

TOTAL TITLE IV LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY GRANTS BY STATE, LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY, FISCAL YEAR, AND AMOUNT

(All States with Local Education Agencies Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Kansas City Sch. Dist.	91,626		--	--	91,626	--	--	--	--
Charleston R-1 Sch.Dist.	186,360		--	--	--	--	59,910	126,450	--
North Pemiscot Reorganized S.D.-1	64,935		--	--	--	--	--	--	64,935
St. Joseph	59,906		--	--	--	--	--	--	59,906
TOTAL	402,827		--	--	91,626	--	59,910	126,450	124,841

TOTAL TITLE IV LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY GRANTS BY STATE, LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY, FISCAL YEAR, AND AMOUNT
(All States with Local Education Agencies Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Wolf Point	15,800		--	--	--	--	--	--	15,800
TOTAL	15,800		--	--	--	--	--	--	15,800

NEVADA

TABLE B 4-40

TOTAL TITLE IV LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY GRANTS BY STATE, LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY, FISCAL YEAR, AND AMOUNT
(All States with Local Education Agencies Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Clark Co. Sch. Dist.	226,232		100,921	--	--	--	62,931	62,380	--
TOTAL	226,232		100,921	--	--	--	62,931	62,380	--

TOTAL TITLE IV LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY GRANTS BY STATE, LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY, FISCAL YEAR, AND AMOUNT
(All States with Local Education Agencies Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Morristown City Sch.Bd.	50,265		50,265	--	--	--	--	--	--
Englewood Pub. Schs.	71,948		--	--	--	71,948	--	--	--
Neptune Township Sch.Dist.	18,825		--	--	--	9,500	9,325	--	--
Fairfield Township Bd. of Ed.	37,072		--	--	--	--	--	37,072	--
Ewing Township	97,500		--	--	--	--	--	--	97,500
Orange Bd of Ed	79,443		--	--	--	--	--	--	79,443
TOTAL	355,053		50,265	--	--	81,448	9,325	37,072	176,943

NEW MEXICO

TABLE B 4-42

TOTAL TITLE IV LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY GRANTS BY STATE, LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY, FISCAL YEAR, AND AMOUNT
(All States with Local Education Agencies Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Los Lunas Conso. Sch.	87,350		--	--	--	40,450	46,900	--	--
Las Vegas City Schs.	84,062		--	--	--	--	41,286	42,776	--
Silver City Con. Sch.	71,660		--	--	--	--	39,660	--	32,000
Bernalillo Pub. Schs.	90,825		--	--	--	--	49,800	41,025	--
Albuquerque Pub. Schs.	50,181		--	--	--	--	--	50,181	--
TOTAL	384,078		--	--	--	40,450	177,646	133,932	32,000

NEW YORK

TABLE B 4-43

TOTAL TITLE IV LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY GRANTS BY STATE, LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY, FISCAL YEAR, AND AMOUNT

(All States with Local Education Agencies Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
New York City Bd of Ed	199,051		--	199,051	--	--	--	--	--
Syracuse Sch. Dist.	12,084		--	12,084	--	--	--	--	--
Roosevelt Pub. Schs.	26,533		--	--	26,533	--	--	--	--
New York City Sch. Bd.	117,443		--	--	--	117,443	--	--	--
Rochester Pub. Schs.	237,200		--	--	--	--	--	100,200	137,000
City of Niagara Falls	200,169		--	--	--	--	--	--	200,169
TOTAL	793,380		--	212,035	26,533	117,443	--	100,200	337,169

NORTH CAROLINA

TABLE B 4-44

TOTAL TITLE IV LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY GRANTS BY STATE, LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY, FISCAL YEAR, AND AMOUNT

(All States with Local Education Agencies Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Randolph Co. Bd of Ed	242,203		135,734	2,000	68,716	35,753	--	--	--
Burke Co. Bd of Ed	183,650		--	109,395	--	37,253	37,002	--	--
Lenoir City Bd of Ed	64,137		--	19,700	--	21,087	--	--	23,350
Moore Co. Bd of Ed	225,122		--	100,222	--	90,000	34,900	--	--
Madison-Mayodan City Bd of Ed	36,000		--	--	16,000	20,000	--	--	--
Carteret Co. Bd of Ed	40,314		--	--	40,314	--	--	--	--
St. Pauls City Bd of Ed	69,947		--	--	69,947	--	--	--	--
Davidson Co. Bd of Ed	78,607		--	--	50,035	13,527	--	15,045	--
(cont.)									

NORTH CAROLINA (cont.)

TABLE B 4-45

TOTAL TITLE IV LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY GRANTS BY STATE, LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY, FISCAL YEAR, AND AMOUNT
(All States with Local Education Agencies Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Chapel Hill Bd of Ed	150,506		--	--	--	60,690	89,816	--	--
Chapel Hill Pub. Schs.	22,466		--	--	--	--	--	22,466	--
Wake Co. Sch. Dist.	135,444		--	--	--	74,708	60,736	--	--
Wake Co. Bd of Ed	22,212		--	--	--	--	--	--	22,212
Chatham Co. Sch. Dist.	24,784		--	--	--	19,047	5,737	--	--
Granson Co. Sch. Dist.	78,673		--	--	--	45,146	--	33,527	--
Alamance Co. Bd. of Ed	49,171		--	--	--	--	24,397	24,774	--
Orange Co. Bd of Ed.	54,993		--	--	--	--	31,825	23,168	--
(cont.)									

TABLE B 4-46

TOTAL TITLE IV LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY GRANTS BY STATE, LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY, FISCAL YEAR, AND AMOUNT

(All States with Local Education Agencies Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Jones Co. Bd of Ed	39,486		--	--	--	--	23,986	--	15,500
Jones Co. Bd. of Ed	1,377		--	--	--	--	--	1,377	--
Asheville City Bd. of Ed	18,037		--	--	--	--	14,487	3,550	--
Chatham Co. Bd of Ed	26,048		--	--	--	--	--	26,048	--
Burlington City Schs.	23,397		--	--	--	--	--	--	23,397
Durham City Sch. Bd.	45,510		--	--	--	--	--	--	45,510
Fayetteville City Bd. of Ed.	28,029		--	--	--	--	--	--	28,029
Hyde County Bd. of Ed.	18,470		--	--	--	--	--	18,470	--

NORTH CAROLINA (cont.)

TABLE B 4-47

TOTAL TITLE IV LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY GRANTS BY STATE, LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY, FISCAL YEAR, AND AMOUNT
(All States with Local Education Agencies Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Winston City Schs.	14,779		--	--	--	--	--	14,779	--
Pitt Co. Bd. of Ed.	14,974		--	--	--	--	--	14,974	--
Robeson Co. Bd. of Ed	15,258		--	--	--	--	--	15,258	--
Salisbury City Schs.	36,226		--	--	--	--	--	17,685	18,541
Wayne Co. Bd of Ed.	21,826		--	--	--	--	--	--	21,826
Roldon City Bd of Ed	35,535		--	--	--	--	--	17,910	17,625
Wilson Co. Bd of Ed	27,399		--	--	--	--	--	--	27,399
Winston-Salem/ Forsythe Co.	42,350		--	--	--	--	--	19,264	23,086
TOTAL	1,895,930		135,734	231,317	254,012	417,211	322,886	268,295	266,475

NORTH CAROLINA (cont.)

TABLE B 4-48

TOTAL TITLE IV LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY GRANTS BY STATE, LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY, FISCAL YEAR, AND AMOUNT
(All States With Local Education Agencies Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Dayton Pub.Schs.	70,000		--	--	--	--	70,000	--	--
Princeton City Sch.Dist.	173,642		--	--	--	--	--	93,126	80,516
Shaker Heights City Sch.Dist.	96,345		--	--	--	--	--	--	96,345
TOTAL	339,987		--	--	--	--	70,000	93,126	176,861

OKLAHOMA

TABLE B 4-49

TOTAL TITLE IV LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY GRANTS BY STATE , LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY, FISCAL YEAR, AND AMOUNT

(All States with Local Education Agencies Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Ardmore Bd of Ed	43,420		--	43,420	--	--	--	--	--
Fox Bd of Ed	47,345		--	--	--	13,841	33,504	--	--
Boggs Bd of Ed	19,114		--	--	--	19,114	--	--	--
Oklahoma City Bd of Ed	185,408		--	--	--	95,408	90,000	--	--
Oklahoma City Pub. Schs.	89,000		--	--	--	--	--	--	89,000
Muskogee Sch. Dist.	75,247		--	--	--	32,247	28,000	--	15,000
Okmulgee Sch. Dist.	62,236		--	--	--	32,076	--	30,160	--
Enid Bd of Ed IDS-57.	31,763		--	--	--	--	31,763	--	--
Chickasha Bd of Ed	30,000		--	--	--	--	--	30,000	--
(cont.)									

TOTAL TITLE IV LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY GRANTS BY STATE, LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY, FISCAL YEAR, AND AMOUNT

(All States with Local Education Agencies Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Chickasha Pub Schs.	16,210		--	--	--	--	--	--	16,210
Stilwell Ind. Sch.Dist.	40,000		--	--	--	--	--	40,000	--
Stilwell Ind. Sch.Dist.-25	45,600		--	--	--	--	--	--	45,600
Dewar Ind. Sch. Dist.-8	4,877		--	--	--	--	--	--	4,877
Hugo Ind. School Dist.-39	4,995		--	--	--	--	--	--	4,995
Tulsa Ind. Sch. Dist.-1	67,050		--	--	--	--	--	--	67,050
TOTAL	762,265		--	43,420	--	192,686	183,267	100,160	242,732

OREGON

TABLE B 4-51

TOTAL TITLE IV LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY GRANTS BY STATE, LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY, FISCAL YEAR, AND AMOUNT
(All States with Local Education Agencies Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Portland Pub. Schs.	148,839		--	--	--	--	--	89,437	59,402
TOTAL	148,839		--	--	--	--	--	89,437	59,402

TABLE B 4-52

TOTAL TITLE IV LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY GRANTS BY STATE, LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY, FISCAL YEAR, AND AMOUNT
(All States with Local Education Agencies Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Phila. Sch.Dist.	198,764		168,764	--	--	--	--	--	30,000
Bristol Sch. Dist.	87,751		--	--	--	--	30,538	57,213	--
Harrisburg City Sch.Dist.	60,000		--	--	--	--	--	--	60,000
Norristown Area Sch. Dist.	15,000		--	--	--	--	--	--	15,000
York City Sch. Dist.	20,100		--	--	--	--	--	--	20,100
TOTAL	381,615		168,764	--	--	--	30,538	57,213	125,100

RHODE ISLAND

TABLE B 4-53

TOTAL TITLE IV LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY GRANTS BY STATE, LOCAL EDCUATION AGENCY, FISCAL YEAR, AND AMOUNT
(All States with Local Education Agencies Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Providence Pub. Schs.	214,623		--	--	--	49,673	44,113	59,950	60,887
TOTAL	214,623		--	--	--	49,673	44,113	59,950	60,887

TOTAL TITLE IV LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY GRANTS BY STATE, LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY, FISCAL YEAR, AND AMOUNT

(All States with Local Education Agencies Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Kershaw Co. Bd. of Ed	58,708		--	--	--	52,608	6,100	--	--
Kershaw Pub.Schs	10,000		--	--	--	--	--	10,000	--
Lexington Co. Sch. Dist.No. 5	49,963		--	--	--	39,963	--	10,000	--
Chester Co. Pub. Sch.	40,685		--	--	--	40,685	--	--	--
Union Co. Sch. Dist.	66,320		--	--	--	--	47,465	18,855	--
Orangeburg Sch. Dist.-5	79,559		--	--	--	--	--	39,799	39,760
Allendale Co. Schs.	26,192		--	--	--	--	--	--	26,192
(cont.)									

SOUTH CAROLINA (cont.)

TABLE B 4-55

TOTAL TITLE IV LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY GRANTS BY STATE, LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY, FISCAL YEAR, AND AMOUNT
(All States with Local Education Agencies Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL	1965	1966	1967 q	1968	1969	1970	1971
Anderson Co. #5	24,614	--	--	--	--	--	--	24,614
Berkeley Co. Bd of Ed	40,000	--	--	--	--	--	--	40,000
Edgefield Co. Sch.Dist.	28,767	--	--	--	--	--	--	28,767
Marlboro Co. Bd of Education	27,796	--	--	--	--	--	--	27,796
Saluda Sch.Dist. No. 1	25,000	--	--	--	--	--	--	25,000
Region V Ed Ser. Ctr.	145,759	--	--	--	--	--	--	145,759
TOTAL	623,363	--	--	--	133,256	53,565	78,654	357,888

TENNESSEE

TABLE B 4-56

TOTAL TITLE IV LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY GRANTS BY STATE, LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY, FISCAL YEAR, AND AMOUNT

(All States with Local Education Agencies Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Chattanooga Pub. Schs.	563,235		149,726	--	170,393	177,256	65,860	--	--
Oak Ridge Bd of Ed	77,287		77,287	--	--	--	--	--	--
Giles Co. Bd of Ed	22,635		--	8,065	14,570	--	--	--	--
Shelby Co. Bd of Ed	107,882		--	--	--	--	64,500	--	43,382
Covington City Schs.	19,507		--	--	--	--	--	--	19,507
TOTAL	790,546		227,013	8,065	184,963	177,256	130,360	--	62,889

TEXAS

TABLE B 4-57

TOTAL TITLE IV LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY GRANTS BY STATE, LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY, FISCAL YEAR, AND AMOUNT
(All States with Local Education Agencies Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Bryan Bd of Ed	71,327		--	71,327	--	--	--	--	--
Sherman Ind.Sch. Dist.	62,990		--	--	--	17,990	--	--	45,000
Ennis Ind Sch. Dist.	101,038		--	--	--	66,038	--	35,000	--
Houston Ind.Sch. Dist.	288,095		--	--	--	--	82,950	205,145	--
Corsicana Ind. Sch.Dist.	258,515		--	--	--	--	126,400	--	132,115
Wilmer-Hutchins Ind.Sch.Dist.	47,626		--	--	--	--	47,626	--	--
Groveton Ind. Sch.Dist.	84,400		--	--	--	--	44,900	--	39,500
Abilene Pub.Schs.	45,000		--	--	--	--	--	45,000	--
El Campo Ind. Sch.Dist.	100,280		--	--	--	--	--	100,280	--
(cont.)									

TABLE B 4-58

TOTAL TITLE IV LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY GRANTS BY STATE, LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY, FISCAL YEAR, AND AMOUNT

(All States with Local Education Agencies Receiving Grants

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Galveston Ind. Sch.Dist.	52,098		--	--	--	--	--	52,098	--
Gladewater Ind. Sch.Dist.	358,580		--	--	--	--	--	168,580	190,000
Pittsburg Ind. Sch.Dist.	110,400		--	--	--	--	--	110,400	--
Waxahachie Ind. Sch.Dist.	13,842		--	--	--	--	--	13,842	--
Wichita Falls Pub. Schs.	48,507		--	--	--	--	--	48,507	--
Bishop Consol. ISD	13,000		--	--	--	--	--	--	13,000
Crystal City Ind.Sch.Dist.	45,505		--	--	--	--	--	--	45,505
Pecos-Bartow Ind.Sch.Dist.	38,594		--	--	--	--	--	--	38,594

(cont.)

TEXAS (cont.)

TABLE B-59

TOTAL TITLE IV LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY GRANTS BY STATE, LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY, FISCAL YEAR, AND AMOUNT

(All States with Local Education Agencies Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Southside Ind. Sch.Dist.	45,000		--	--	--	--	--	--	45,000
TOTAL	1,784,797		--	71,327	--	84,028	301,876	778,852	548,714

VIRGINIA

TABLE B 4-60

TOTAL TITLE IV LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY GRANTS BY STATE, LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY, FISCAL YEAR, AND AMOUNT

(All States with Local Education Agencies Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Fairfax Co.Sch. Bd.	74,800	35,770	39,030	--	--	--	--	--
Arlington Co. Sch.Bd.	213,745	75,000		--	50,931	--	--	--
Richmond Pub. Schs.	469,313	150,670	--	147,474	61,169	--	110,000	--
Charlottesville City Sch.Bd.	63,458	--	29,357	--	--	20,795	13,306	--
Lynchburg Pub. Schs.	77,512	--	20,183	--	--	29,259	28,070	--
Clifton Forge City Sch.Bd.	36,890	--	--	36,890	--	--	--	--
Hampton City Sch Bd.	98,260	--	--	13,060	29,986	32,658	22,556	--
Portsmouth Sch. Bd.	113,870	--	--	--	43,291	47,586	22,993	--

(cont.)

VIRGINIA (cont.)

TABLE B 4-61

TOTAL TITLE IV LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY GRANTS BY STATE, LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY, FISCAL YEAR, AND AMOUNT

(All States with Local Education Agencies Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Fluvanna Co. Bd. of Ed.	22,389		--	--	--	--	22,389	--	--
Nansemond Co. Bd of Ed.	28,440		--	--	--	--	28,440	--	--
Lexington City Bd. of Ed.	7,764		--	--	--	--	7,764	--	--
✓ Williamsburg James City Co. Sch. Bd.	31,921		--	--	--	--	14,400	17,521	--
New Kent Co.Schs.	17,525		--	--	--	--	17,525	--	--
Amelia Co.Schs.	51,845		--	--	--	--	16,625	15,440	19,780
Pittsylvania Co. Schs.	49,730		--	--	--	--	49,730	--	--
Chesapeake Pub. Schs.	102,283		--	--	--	--	37,283	65,000	--
(cont.)									

VIRGINIA (cont.)

TABLE B 4-62

TOTAL TITLE IV LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY GRANTS BY STATE, LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY, FISCAL YEAR, AND AMOUNT

(All States with Local Education Agencies Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Norfolk City Bd of Ed	45,000		--	--	--	--	45,000	--	--
Amherst Co.Sch. Bd	26,653		--	--	--	--	--	26,653	--
Danville Sch.Bd	18,975		--	--	--	--	--	18,975	--
Fluvanna Co.Schs	21,300		--	--	--	--	--	21,300	--
Franklin City Schs.	16,170		--	--	--	--	--	16,170	--
Greenville Co. Sch Bd	30,414		--	--	--	--	--	15,137	15,277
Louisa Co.Schs.	14,562		--	--	--	--	--	14,562	--
Lunenburg Co. Schools	10,496		--	--	--	--	--	10,496	--

(cont.)

VIRGINIA (cont.)

TABLE B 4-63

TOTAL TITLE IV LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY GRANTS BY STATE, LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY, FISCAL YEAR, AND AMOUNT

(All States with Local Education Agencies Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Mecklenburg Co. Sch.Bd.	6,466		--	--	--	--	--	6,466	--
New Kent Co. Sch Bd	18,025		--	--	--	--	--	18,025	--
Newport News Sch Bd	25,486		--	--	--	--	--	25,436	--
Norfolk City Sch	52,500		--	--	--	--	--	52,500	--
Northumberland Co.Sch.Bd.	16,070		--	--	--	--	--	16,070	--
Nottoway Co. Sch. Bd.	17,300		--	--	--	--	--	17,300	--
Pittsylvania Co. Sch.Bd.	50,050		--	--	--	--	--	50,050	--
Roanoke City Schs.	22,000		--	--	--	--	--	22,000	--
(cont.)									

VIRGINIA (cont.)

TABLE B 4-64

TOTAL TITLE IV LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY GRANTS BY STATE, LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY, FISCAL YEAR, AND AMOUNT
(All States with Local Education Agencies Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Bristol Co.,	14,518		--	--	--	--	--	--	14,518
Campbell Co. Sch. Dist.	18,519		--	--	--	--	--	--	18,519
Essex-Middlesex Co.Schs.	18,850		--	--	--	--	--	--	18,850
Goochland Co. Schs.	19,582		--	--	--	--	--	--	19,582
Lancaster Co. Sch. Bd.	19,345		--	--	--	--	--	--	19,345
Louisa Co. Pub. Schs.	17,915		--	--	--	--	--	--	17,915
Richmond Co. Sch. Bd.	20,560		--	--	--	--	--	--	20,560
York Co. Sch.Bd.	20,150		--	--	--	--	--	--	20,150
TOTAL	2,000,651		261,440	176,384	197,424	185,377	369,454	626,076	184,496

WASHINGTON

TABLE B 4-65

TOTAL TITLE IV LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY GRANTS BY STATE, LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY, FISCAL YEAR, AND AMOUNT

(All States with Local Education Agencies Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Seattle Pub. Sch.	22,675		--	--	--	14,175	--	--	85,500
Tacoma Sch. Dist	98,685		--	--	--	53,805	--	44,880	--
Seattle Sch.Dist No. 1	22,191		--	--	--	--	22,191	--	--
Tacoma Sch.Dist. No. 10	144,000		--	--	--	--	59,000	--	85,000
TOTAL	364,641		--	--	--	67,980	81,281	44,880	170,500

TOTAL TITLE IV LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY GRANTS BY STATE, LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY, FISCAL YEAR, AND AMOUNT
(All States with Local Education Agencies Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Cabell Co. Schs	14,037		--	--	--	--	--	--	14,037
TOTAL	14,037		--	--	--	--	--	--	14,037

TABLE C 1-1

UNIVERSITY DESEGREGATION CENTERS

Alabama
Intercultural Center for Southern Alabama**
University of South Alabama
Mobile, Alabama

Auburn Center for Assistance with Problems Arising from School Desegregation**
Auburn University
Auburn, Alabama

Arkansas
Arkansas Technical Assistance and Consultative Center
Ouachita Baptist University
Arkadelphia, Arkansas

California
Center for the Study of Ethnic Accommodation
University of California
Riverside, California

Delaware
Educational Consulting Center for School Personnel*
University of Delaware
Newark, Delaware

Florida
Florida School Desegregation Consulting Center**
University of Miami
Coral Gables, Florida

Georgia
School Desegregation Education Center**
College of Education
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia

Kentucky
Western Kentucky Human Relations Center for Education*
Western Kentucky University
Bowling Green, Kentucky

Louisiana
Educational Resource Center on School Desegregation**
Tulane University
New Orleans, Louisiana

Mississippi
The Consultant Center
Mississippi State University
State College, Mississippi

New Mexico
Consultative and Technical Center**
University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, New Mexico

New York
National Center for Education and Research
Columbia University
New York, New York

North Carolina
Educational Leadership and Human Relations Center**
St. Augustine's College
Raleigh, North Carolina

Oklahoma
Consultative Center for School Desegregation**
University of Oklahoma
Norman, Oklahoma

Pennsylvania
Office of Research and Field Services
School of Education
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

South Carolina
South Carolina Desegregation Center**
University of South Carolina
Columbia, South Carolina

Tennessee
Educational Opportunities Planning Center**
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, Tennessee

Texas
Texas Educational Desegregation Technical and Advisory Center
University of Texas
Division of Extension
Office of Extension Teaching and Field Service Bureau
Austin, Texas

Virginia
Consultative Resource Center for School Desegregation**
University of Virginia
Charlottesville, Virginia

*No longer funded.
**Centers visited by members of Commission staff.

APPENDIX B

TABLE C 2

TITLE IV UNIVERSITY DESEGREGATION CENTERS BY STATE, FISCAL YEAR, AND FUNDING LEVEL (All states with Centers)

	TOTAL	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
ALABAMA	2,176,975	--	--	--	287,981	416,589	962,119	510,286
ARKANSAS	1,259,622	--	--	--	--	247,305	658,419	353,898
CALIFORNIA	664,995	--	--	--	--	--	299,998	364,997
DELAWARE	381,758	--	--	--	99,224	137,618	144,916	--
FLORIDA	2,671,611	--	340,650	235,931	261,923	375,325	847,050	610,732
GEORGIA	1,285,269	--	--	--	216,409	246,386	617,514	204,960
KENTUCKY	245,933	--	--	--	222,021	23,912	--	--
LOUISIANA	1,335,935	--	--	--	167,742	225,295	642,898	300,000
MISSISSIPPI	1,498,436	--	--	--	149,182	209,633	659,421	480,200
NEW MEXICO	955,671	--	--	--	--	190,000	494,761	270,910
NEW YORK	130,718	--	--	--	--	--	89,715	41,003
NORTH CAROLINA	906,927	--	--	--	199,260	247,239	290,214	170,214
OKLAHOMA	1,499,491	--	--	--	314,062	323,224	558,938	303,267
PENNSYLVANIA	140,313	--	--	--	--	--	--	140,313
SOUTH CAROLINA	1,588,886	--	--	--	220,370	239,096	704,697	424,723
TENNESSEE	798,519	--	--	--	98,432	200,087	300,000	200,000
TEXAS	2,042,374	--	--	--	409,534	349,999	648,500	634,341
VIRGINIA	703,890	--	--	--	180,754	138,128	249,231	135,777

TABLE C 3

TITLE IV UNIVERSITY DESEGREGATION CENTERS BY STATE, FISCAL YEAR, AND FUNDING LEVELS (SOUTHERN AND BORDER STATES)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
ALABAMA	2,176,975		--	--	--	287,981	416,589	962,119	510,286
ARKANSAS	1,259,622		--	--	--	--	247,305	658,419	353,898
DELAWARE	381,758		--	--	--	99,224	137,618	144,916	--
FLORIDA	2,671,611		--	340,650	235,931	261,923	375,325	847,050	610,732
GEORGIA	1,285,269		--	--	--	216,409	246,386	617,514	204,960
KENTUCKY	245,933		--	--	--	222,021	23,912	--	--
LOUISIANA	1,335,935		--	--	--	167,742	225,295	642,898	300,000
MISSISSIPPI	1,498,426		--	--	--	149,182	209,633	659,421	480,200
NORTH CAROLINA	906,927		--	--	--	199,260	247,239	290,214	170,214
OKLAHOMA	1,499,491		--	--	--	314,062	323,224	558,938	303,267
SOUTH CAROLINA	1,588,836		--	--	--	220,370	239,096	704,697	424,723
TENNESSEE	798,519		--	--	--	98,432	200,087	300,000	200,000
TEXAS	2,042,374		--	--	--	409,534	349,999	648,500	634,341
VIRGINIA	703,890		--	--	--	180,754	138,128	249,231	135,777
TOTAL	18,395,626		--	340,650	235,931	2,826,894	3,379,836	7,283,917	4,228,[illegible]

TABLE C 4

TITLE IV DESEGREGATION CENTERS BY STATE, FISCAL YEAR, AND FUNDING LEVEL (Non Southern and Border States)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
CALIFORNIA	664,995		--	--	--	--	--	299,998	364,997
NEW YORK	130,718		--	--	--	--	--	89,715	41,003
PENNSYLVANIA	140,313		--	--	--	--	--	--	140,313
NEW MEXICO	955,671		--	--	--	--	190,000	494,761	270,910
TOTAL	1,891,697		--	--	--	--	190,000	884,474	817,223

CALIFORNIA

TABLE C 5-3

TITLE IV DESEGREGATION CENTERS

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Univ. of Cal. Riverside	664,995		--	--	--	--	--	299,998	364,997
TOTAL	664,995		--	--	--	--	--	299,998	364,997

ALABAMA

TABLE C 5-1

TITLE IV UNIVERSITY DESEGREGATION CENTERS BY STATE, SPONSOR, FISCAL YEAR AND FUNDING LEVEL (All States with Centers)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Auburn Univ. Auburn	847,758		--	--	--	112,305	192,627	321,413	221,413
Univ. of S. Ala. Mobile	1,329,217		--	--	--	175,676	223,962	640,706	288,873
TOTAL	2,176,975		--	--	--	287,981	416,589	962,119	510,286

ARKANSAS

TABLE C 5-2

TITLE IV DESEGREGATION CENTERS

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Ouachita Baptist Univ., Arkadelphia	1,259,622		--	--	--	--	247,305	658,419	353,898
TOTAL	1,259,622		--	--	--	--	247,305	658,419	353,898

DELAWARE

TABLE C 5-4

TITLE IV DESEGREGATION CENTERS

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Univ. of Deleware Newark	381,758		--	--	--	99,224	137,618	144,916	--
TOTAL	381,758		--	--	--	99,224	137,618	144,916	--

FLORIDA

TABLE C 5-5

TITLE IV DESEGREGATION CENTERS

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Florida State Univ., Tallahassee	280,605		--	137,309	143,296	--	--	--	--
Univ. of Miami Coral Gables	2,391,006		--	203,341	92,635	261,923	375,325	847,050	610,732
TOTAL	2,671,611		--	340,650	235,931	261,923	375,325	847,050	610,732

GEORGIA

TABLE C 5-6

TITLE IV DESEGREGATION CENTERS

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Univ. of Georgia Athens	1,274,064		--	--	--	216,409	246,386	606,309	204,960
Southeastern Ed. Lab., Atlanta	11,205		--	--	--	--	--	11,205	--
TOTAL	1,285,269		--	--	--	216,409	246,386	617,514	204,960

KENTUCKY

TABLE C 5-7

TITLE IV DESEGREGATION CENTERS

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Western Ky. Univ. Bowling Green	245,933		--	--	--	222,021	23,912	--	--
TOTAL	245,933		--	--	--	222,021	23,912	--	--

LOUISIANA

TABLE C 5-8

TITLE IV DESEGREGATION CENTERS

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Tulane Univ. New Orleans	1,335,935		--	--	--	167,742	225,295	642,898	300,000
TOTAL	1,335,935		--	--	--	167,742	225,295	642,898	300,000

MISSISSIPPI

TABLE C 5-9

TITLE IV DESEGREGATION CENTERS

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Miss. State Univ State College	480,200		--	--	--	--	--	--	480,200
Miss. State Univ. Starksville	659,421		--	--	--	--	--	659,421	--
Univ. of Southern Miss., Hattiesburg	358,815		--	--	--	149,182	209,633	--	--
TOTAL	1,498,436		--	--	--	149,182	209,633	659,421	480,200

NEW MEXICO

TABLE C 5-10

TITLE IV DESEGREGATION CENTERS

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970'	1971
Univ. of N. Mex. Albuquerque	955,671		--	--	--	--	190,000	494,761	270,910
TOTAL	955,671		--	--	--	--	190,000	494,761	270,910

NEW YORK

TABLE C 5-11

TITLE IV DESEGREGATION CENTERS

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Teachers Coll. Columbia Univ. New York, N.Y.	130,718		--	--	--	--	--	89,715	41,003
TOTAL	130,718		--	--	--	--	--	89,715	41,003

NORTH CAROLINA

TABLE C 5-12

TITLE IV DESEGREGATION CENTERS

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
St. Augustine's Col. Raleigh	906,927		--	--	--	199,260	247,239	290,214	170,214
TOTAL	906,927		--	--	--	199,260	247,239	290,214	170,214

OKLAHOMA

TABLE C 5-13

TITLE IV DESEGREGATION CENTERS

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Univ. of Oklahoma Norman	1,499,491		--	--	--	314,062	323,224	558,938	303,267
TOTAL	1,499,491		--	--	--	314,062	323,224	558,938	303,267

PENNSYLVANIA

TABLE C 5-14

TITLE IV DESEGREGATION CENTERS

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Univ. of Pitts-burgh, Pitts.	140,313		--	--	--	--	--	--	140,313
TOTAL	140,313		--	--	--	--	--	--	140,313

SOUTH CAROLINA

TABLE C 5-15

TITLE IV DESEGREGATION CENTERS

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Univ. of South Carolina	1,588,886		--	--	--	220,370	239,096	704,697	424,723
TOTAL	1,588,886		--	--	--	220,370	239,096	704,697	424,723

TENNESSEE

TABLE C 5-16

UNIVERSITY DESEGREGATION CENTERS

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Univ. of Tenn. Knoxville	798,519		--	--	--	98,432	200,087	300,000	200,000
TOTAL	798,519		--	--	--	98,432	200,087	300,000	200,000

TEXAS

TABLE C 5-17

UNIVERSITY DESEGREGATION CENTERS

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Univ. of Texas Austin	2,042,374		--	--	--	409,534	349,999	648,500	634,341
TOTAL	2,042,374		--	--	--	409,534	349,999	648,500	634,341

VIRGINIA

TABLE C 5-18

UNIVERSITY DESEGREGATION CENTERS

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Univ. of Va. Charlottesville	703,890		--	--	--	180,754	138,128	249,231	135,777
TOTAL	703,890		--	--	--	180,754	138,128	249,231	135,777

TABLE D 1-1

TOTAL TITLE IV INSTITUTE GRANTS BY STATE AND FISCAL YEAR (All States)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
ALABAMA	868,542		337,528	131,994	384,471	14,549	--	--	--
ARIZONA	26,040		26,040	--	--	--	--	--	--
ARKANSAS	484,037		--	174,836	148,736	49,920	60,545	50,000	--
CALIFORNIA	575,703		182,795	204,971	90,315	--	49,183	48,439	--
COLORADO	83,320		--	--	--	--	--	--	83,320
CONNECTICUT	296,151		--	--	--	--	--	83,384	212,767
DELAWARE	132,449		39,786	42,494	50,169	--	--	--	--
FLORIDA	1,400,864		971,283	377,702	51,879	--	--	--	--
GEORGIA	578,675		--	101,816	369,818	107,041	--	--	--
IDAHO	14,975		--	--	--	--	--	--	14,975
ILLINOIS	382,462		--	--	98,206	129,924	--	--	154,332
INDIANA	86,660		51,093	35,567	--	--	--	--	--
IOWA	160,669		--	--	--	--	--	--	160,669
KANSAS	75,032		--	--	--	--	--	--	75,032
KENTUCKY	678,958		79,375	199,208	400,000	--	--	--	--
LOUISIANA	229,313		--	17,420	111,893	--	--	50,000	50,000
MARYLAND	57,072		18,652	38,420	--	--	--	--	--

TABLE D 1-2

TOTAL TITLE IV INSTITUTE GRANTS BY STATE AND FISCAL YEAR (All States)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
MICHIGAN	465,996		27,940	101,898	53,150	54,216	--	98,792	130,000
MINNESOTA	65,000		--	--	--	--	--	--	65,000
MISSISSIPPI	543,024		130,721	197,978	114,325	--	--	--	100,000
MISSOURI	332,489		78,740	36,117	--	--	60,067	69,039	88,526
MONTANA	60,000		--	--	--	--	--	--	60,000
NEW JERSEY	86,940		--	--	--	--	--	--	86,940
NEW YORK	786,393		117,085	188,903	193,056	116,311	124,342	--	46,606
NEW MEXICO	74,756		--	74,756	--	--	--	--	--
NORTH CAROLINA	797,551		167,413	173,285	190,201	194,792	71,860	--	--
OHIO	124,596		--	--	--	--	--	--	124,596
OREGON	91,847		--	73,988	5,905	--	--	--	11,954
OKLAHOMA	703,261		170,201	234,854	298,906	--	--	--	--
PENNSYLVANIA	171,663		36,954	69,407	--	--	--	--	65,302
TEXAS	817,131		70,051	63,835	258,375	260,870	114,000	--	50,000
SOUTH CAROLINA	33,382		--	--	33,382	--	--	--	--
TENNESSEE	979,862		427,914	358,353	193,595	--	--	--	--

TABLE D 1-3

TOTAL TITLE IV INSTITUTE GRANTS BY STATE AND FISCAL YEAR (All States)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
VIRGINIA	665,087		--	215,136	382,783	--	35,000	--	32,168
WASHINGTON	120,416		--	--	--	84,656	--	--	35,760
WEST VIRGINIA	124,497		--	27,706	--	14,313	65,429	--	17,049
TOTAL	13,175,048		2,933,571	3,140,644	3,429,165	1,026,592	580,426	399,654	1,664,996

TABLE D 2-1

TOTAL TITLE IV INSTITUTE GRANTS BY STATE AND FISCAL YEAR (States Visited by Commission Staff)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
ALABAMA	868,542		337,528	131,994	384,471	14,549	--	--	--
FLORIDA	1,400,864		971,283	377,702	51,879	--	--	--	--
GEORGIA	578,675		--	101,816	369,818	107,041	--	--	--
LOUISIANA	229,313		--	17,420	111,893	--	--	50,000	50,000
MISSISSIPPI	543,024		130,721	197,978	114,325	--	--	--	100,000
NEW MEXICO	74,756		--	74,756	--	--	--	--	--
NORTH CAROLINA	797,551		167,413	173,285	190,201	194,792	71,860	--	--
OKLAHOMA	703,961		170,201	234,854	298,906	--	--	--	--
SOUTH CAROLINA	33,382		--	--	33,382	--	--	--	--
TENNESSEE	979,862		427,914	358,353	193,595	--	--	--	--
TEXAS	817,131		70,051	63,835	258,375	260,870	114,000	--	50,000
VIRGINIA	665,087		--	215,136	282,783	--	35,000	--	32,168
TOTAL	7,692,148		2,275,111	1,947,129	2,389,628	577,252	220,860	50,000	232,168

TABLE D 3 1

TOTAL TITLE IV INSTITUTE PROJECT GRANTS BY STATE AND FISCAL YEAR (Southern and Border States)

	TOTAL		1965i	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
ALABAMA	868,542		337,528	131,994	384,471	14,549	--	--	--
ARKANSAS	484,037		--	174,836	148,736	49,920	60,545	50,000	--
FLORIDA	1,400,864		971,283	377,702	51,879	--	--	--	--
GEORGIA	578,675		--	101,816	369,818	107,041	--	--	--
KENTUCKY	678,583		79,375	199,208	400,000	--	--	--	--
LOUISIANA	229,313		--	17,420	111,893	--	--	50,000	50,000
MARYLAND	57,072		18,652	38,420	--	--	--	--	--
MISSISSIPPI	543,024		130,721	197,978	114,325	--	--	--	100,000
MISSOURI	332,489		78,740	36,117	--	--	60,067	69,039	88,526
DELAWARE	132,449		39,786	42,494	50,169	--	--	--	--
NORTH CAROLINA	797,551		167,413	173,285	190,201	194,792	71,860	--	--
OKLAHOMA	703,961		170,201	234,854	298,906	--	--	--	--
SOUTH CAROLINA	33,382		--	--	33,382	--	--	--	--
TENNESSEE	979,862		427,914	358,353	193,595	--	--	--	--
TEXAS	817,131		70,051	63,835	258,375	260,870	114,000	--	50,000
VIRGINIA	665,087		--	215,136	382,783	--	35,000	--	32,168
WEST VIRGINIA	124,497		--	27,706	--	14,313	65,429	--	17,049

TABLE D 4-1

TOTAL TITLE IV INSTITUTE PROJECT GRANTS BY SYATE AND FISCAL YEAR (Non Southern and Border States)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
ARIZONA	26,040		26,040	--	--	--	--	--	--
CALIFORNIA	575,703		182,795	204,971	90,315	--	49,183	48,439	--
COLORADO	83,320		--	--	--	--	--	--	83,320
CONNECTICUT	296,151		--	--	--	--	--	83,384	212,767
IDAHO	14,975		--	--	--	--	--	--	14,975
ILLINOIS	382,462		--	--	98,206	129,924	--	--	154,332
INDIANA	86,660		51,093	35,567	--	--	--	--	--
IOWA	160,669		--	--	--	--	--	--	160,669
KANSAS	75,032		--	--	--	--	--	--	75,032
MICHIGAN	465,996		27,940	101,898	53,150	54,216	--	98,792	130,000
MINNESOTA	65,000		--	--	--	--	--	--	65,000
MONTANA	60,000		--	--	--	--	--	--	60,000
NEW JERSEY	86,940		--	--	--	--	--	--	86,940
NEW YORK	786,303		117,085	188,903	193,056	116,311	124,342	--	46,606
(cont.)									

TABLE D 4-2

TITLE IV INSTITUTES PROJECTS (Other than Southern and Border States)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
OHIO	124,596		--	--	--	--	--	--	124,596
OREGON	91,847		--	73,988	5,905	--	--	--	11,954
PENNSYLVANIA	171,663		36,954	69,407	--	--	--	--	65,302
WASHINGTON	120,416		--	--	--	84,656	--	--	35,760
TOTAL	3,673,773		441,907	674,734	440,632	385,107	173,525	230,615	1,327,253

ALABAMA

TABLE D 5-1

TOTAL TITLE IV INSTITUTE PROJECT GRANTS BY STATE, SPONSOR, AND FISCAL YEAR (All States Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Spring Hill College, Mobile	228,639		63,095	66,540	84,455	14,549	--	--	--
Auburn Univ., Auburn	518,369		274,433	65,454	178,477	--	--	--	--
Univ. of South Alabama, Mobile	121,539		--	--	121,539	--	--	--	--
TOTAL	868,542		337,528	131,994	384,471	14,549	--	--	--

ARKANSAS

TABLE D 5-2

TOTAL TITLE IV INSTITUTE PROJECT GRANTS BY STATE, SPONSOR, AND FISCAL YEAR (All States Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Ouachita Baptist Univ. Arkadelphia	223,001		--	112,262	60,819	49,920	--	--	--
Henderson State Teachers Coll. Arkadelphia	40,375		--	40,375	--	--	--	--	--
Philander Smith College, Little Rock	110,116		--	22,199	87,917	--	--	--	--
Univ. of Ark. Fayetteville	110,545		--	--	--	--	60,545	50,000	--
TOTAL	484,037		--	174,836	148,736	49,920	60,545	50,000	--

ARIZONA

TABLE D 5-3

TOTAL TITLE IV INSTITUTE PROJECT GRANTS BY STATE, SPONSOR, AND FISCAL YEAR (All States Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Arizona State Univ., Tempe	26,040		26,040	--	--	--	--	--	--
TOTAL	26,040		26,040	--	--	--	--	--	--

CALIFORNIA

TABLE D 5-4

TOTAL TITLE IV INSTITUTE PROJECT GRANTS BY STATE, SPONSOR, AND FISCAL YEAR (All States Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Stanford Univ. Palo Alto	77,183		45,828	31,355	--	--	--	--	--
Univ. of Calif. Berkeley	259,603		136,967	74,197	--	--	--	48,439	--
Calif. St. Coll. Los Angeles	238,917		--	99,419	90,315	--	49,183	--	--
TOTAL	575,703		182,795	204,971	90,315	--	49,183	48,439	--

COLORADO

TABLE D 5-5

TOTAL TITLE IV INSTITUTE PROJECT GRANTS BY STATE, SPONSOR, AND FISCAL YEAR (All States Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Fort Lewis Coll. Durango	28,320		--	--	--	--	--	--	28,320
Northern Colorado State College	55,000		--	--	--	--	--	--	55,000
TOTAL	83,320		--	--	--	--	--	--	83,320

CONNECTICUT

TABLE D 5-6

TOTAL TITLE IV INSTITUTE PROJECT GRANTS BY STATE, SPONSOR, AND FISCAL YEAR (All States Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
University of Hartford Hartford	296,151		--	--	--	--	--	83,384	212,767
TOTAL	296,151		--	--	--	--	--	83,384	212,767

DELAWARE

TABLE D 5-7

TOTAL TITLE IV INSTITUTE PROJECT GRANTS BY STATE, SPONSOR, AND FISCAL YEAR (All States Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Univ. of Delaware, Newark	132,449		39,786	42,494	50,169	--	--	--	--
TOTAL	132,449		39,786	42,494	50,169	--	--	--	--

FLORIDA

TABLE D 5-8

TOTAL TITLE IV INSTITUTE PROJECT GRANTS BY STATE, SPONSOR, AND FISCAL YEAR (All States Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Univ. of Miami Coral Gables	423,045		299,340	123,705	--	--	--	--	--
Univ. of Florida Gainesville	331,781		256,781	75,000	--	--	--	--	--
Stetson Univ. Deland	205,485		105,232	100,253	--	--	--	--	--
Bethune-Cookman Daytona Beach	185,912		96,533	37,500	51,879	--	--	--	--
Florida State University Tallahassee	254,641		213,397	41,244	--	--	--	--	--
TOTAL	1,400,864		971,283	377,702	51,879	--	--	--	--

GEORGIA

TABLE D 5-9

TOTAL TITLE IV INSTITUTE PROJECT GRANTS BY STATE, SPONSOR, AND FISCAL YEAR (All States Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Paine College Augusta	133,971			53,872	33,924	--	--	--	--
Clark College Augusta	82,045			47,944	34,101	--	--	--	--
Emory University Atlanta	293,317		--	--	186,276	107,041	--	--	--
Georgia Southern College Statesboro	69,342		--	--	69,342	--	--	--	--
TOTAL	578,675		--	101,816	369,818	107,041	--	--	--

IDAHO

TABLE D 5-10

TOTAL TITLE IV INSTITUTE PROJECT GRANTS BY STATE, SPONSOR, AND FISCAL YEAR (All States Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Boise State College, Boise	14,975		--	--	--	--	--	--	14,975
TOTAL	14,975		--	--	--	--	--	--	14,975

ILLINOIS

TABLE D 5-11

TOTAL TITLE IV INSTITUTE PROJECT GRANTS BY STATE, SPONSOR, AND FISCAL YEAR (All States Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Illinois State University Normal	78,192		--	--	--	--	--	--	78,192
National College of Education Evanston	76,140		--	--	--	--	--	--	76,140
Illinois Teacher College, Chicago	98,206		--	--	98,206	--	--	--	--
Northeastern Ill St. College, Chicago	129,924		--	--	--	129,924	--	--	--
TOTAL	382,462		--	--	98,206	129,924	--	--	154,332

INDIANA

TABLE D 5-12

TOTAL TITLE IV INSTITUTE PROJECT GRANTS BY STATE, SPONSOR, AND FISCAL YEAR (All States Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Purdue Univ. Lafayette	51,093		51,093	--	--	--	--	--	--
Vincennes Univ. Vincennes	35,567		--	35,567	--	--	--	--	--
TOTAL	86,660		51,093	35,567	--	--	--	--	--

TOTAL TITLE IV INSTITUTE PROJECT GRANTS BY STATE, SPONSOR, AND FISCAL YEAR (All States Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Univ. of Iowa Iowa City	160,669		--	--	--	--	--	--	160,669
TOTAL	160,669		--	--	--	--	--	--	160,669

KANSAS

TABLE D 5-14

TOTAL TITLE IV INSTITUTE PROJECT GRANTS BY STATE, SPONSOR, AND FISCAL YEAR (All States Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Wichita State Univ.	75,032		--	--	--	--	--	--	75,032
TOTAL	75,032		--	--	--	--	--	--	75,032

KENTUCKY

TABLE D 5-15

TOTAL TITLE IV INSTITUTE PROJECT GRANTS BY STATE, SPONSOR, AND FISCAL YEAR (All States Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Univ. of Kentucky Lexington	127,393		60,282	67,111	--	--	--	--	--
Western Kentucky State College Bowling Green	551,190		19,093	132,097	400,000	--	--	--	--
TOTAL	678,583		79,375	199,208	400,000	--	--	--	--

LOUISIANA

TABLE D 5-16

TOTAL TITLE IV INSTITUTE PROJECT GRANTS BY STATE, SPONSOR, AND FISCAL YEAR (All States Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Louisiana State Univ., New Orleans	17,420		--	17,420	--	--	--	--	--
Tulane Univ. New Orleans	111,893		--	--	111,893	--	--	--	--
Northeast Univ. Monroe	100,000		--	--	--	--	--	50,000	50,000
TOTAL	229,313		--	17,420	111,893	--	--	50,000	50,000

MARYLAND

TABLE D 5-17

TOTAL TITLE IV INSTITUTE PROJECT GRANTS BY STATE, SPONSOR, AND FISCAL YEAR (All States Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
University of Maryland College Park	18,652		18,652	--	--	--	--	--	--
Coppin State College, Balt.	38,420		--	38,420	--	--	--	--	--
TOTAL	57,072		18,652	38,420	--	--	--	--	--

MICHIGAN

TABLE D 5-18

TOTAL TITLE IV INSTITUTE PROJECT GRANTS BY STATE, SPONSOR, AND FISCAL YEAR (All States Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Univ. of Detroit Detroit	162,514		27,940	27,208	53,150	54,216	--	--	--
Wayne State Univ. Detroit	74,690		--	74,690	--	--	--	--	--
Univ. of Mich. Ann Arbor	228,792		--	--	--	--	--	98,792	130,000
TOTAL	465,996		27,940	101,898	53,150	54,216	--	98,792	130,000

MINNESOTA

TABLE D 5-19

TOTAL TITLE IV INSTITUTE PROJECT GRANTS BY STATE, SPONSOR, AND FISCAL YEAR (All States Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
College of Ed. Univ. of Minn Minneapolis	65,000		--	--	--	--	--	--	65,000
TOTAL	65,000		--	--	--	--	--	--	65,000

MISSISSIPPI

TABLE D 5-20

TOTAL TITLE IV INSTITUTE PROJECT GRANTS BY STATE, SPONSOR, AND FISCAL YEAR (All States Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Univ. of Miss. Oxford	328,699		130,721	197,978	--	--	--	--	--
Univ. of So. Mississippi, Hattiesburg	114,325		--	--	114,325	--	--	--	--
Miss. State Col. Jackson	100,000		--	---		--	--	--	100,000
TOTAL	543,024		130,721	197,978	114,325	--	--	--	100,000

MISSOURI

TABLE D 5-21

TOTAL TITLE IV INSTITUTE PROJECT GRANTS BY STATE, SPONSOR, AND FISCAL YEAR (All States Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
St. Louis Univ. St. Louis	44,666		44,666	--	--	--	--	--	--
Univ. of Missouri	70,191		34,074	36,117	--	--	--	--	--
Northeast Mo. State College Cape Girardeau	217,632		--	--	--	--	60,067	69,039	88,526
TOTAL	332,489		78,740	36,117	--	--	60,067	69,039	88,526

MONTANA

TABLE D 5-22

TOTAL TITLE IV INSTITUTE PROJECT GRANTS BY STATE, SPONSOR, AND FISCAL YEAR (All States Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Univ. of Montana	60,000		--	--	--	--	--	--	60,000
TOTAL	60,000		--	--	--	--	--	--	60,000

NEW JERSEY

TABLE D 5-23

TOTAL TITLE IV INSTITUTE PROJECT GRANTS BY STATE, SPONSOR, AND FISCAL YEAR (All States Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Rider College Trenton	86,940		--	--	--	--	--	--	86,940
TOTAL	86,940		--	--	--	--	--	--	86,940

NEW MEXICO

TABLE D 5-24

TOTAL TITLE IV INSTITUTE PROJECT GRANTS BY STATE, SPONSOR, AND FISCAL YEAR (All States Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
New Mexico Stat Univ., University Park	74,756		--	74,756	--	--	--	--	--
TOTAL	74,756		--	74,756	--	--	--	--	--

NEW YORK

TABLE D 5-25

TOTAL TITLE IV INSTITUTE PROJECT GRANTS BY STATE, SPONSOR, AND FISCAL YEAR (All States Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Syracuse Univ. Syracuse	46,606		--	--	--	--	--	--	46,606
Yeshiva Univ. New York	15,850		15,850	--	--	--	--	--	--
State Univ. of N.Y., Albany	200,053		51,716	83,651	64,691	--	--	--	--
New York Univ. New York	49,519		49,519	--	--	--	--	--	--
Southampton Col. Southampton, Long Island	105,252		--	105,252	--	--	--	--	--
Oak Street Col. New York	50,430		--	--	50,430	--	--	--	--
State Univ. of N.Y., Buffalo	88,077		--	--	42,753	45,324	--	--	--
State Univ. of N.Y., Brockport	213,442		--	--	35,182	53,918	124,342	--	--
Columbia Univ.	17,060		--	--	--	17,060	--	--	--
[illegible]	[illegible]		[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

NORTh CAROLINA

TABLE D 5-26

TOTAL TITLE IV INSTITUTE PROJECT GRANTS BY STATE, SPONSOR, AND FISCAL YEAR (All States Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Univ. of North Carolina, Chapel Hill	358,085		124,242	101,256	--	132,587	--	--	--
St. Augustine's College, Raleigh	305,401		43,171	72,029	190,201	--	--	--	--
James Spout Institute Kernersville	107,295		--	--	--	62,205	45,090	--	--
Elizabeth City State College, Elizabeth City	26,860		--	--	--	--	26,860	--	--
TOTAL	797,551		167,413	173,285	190,201	194,792	71,860	--	--

OHIO

TOTAL TITLE IV INSTITUTE PROJECT GRANTS BY STATE, SPONSOR, AND FISCAL YEAR (All States Receiving Grants) TABLE D 5-27

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Ohio State Univ. Research Foundation, Columbus	124,596		--	--	--	--	--	--	124,596
TOTAL	124,596		--	--	--	--	--	--	124,596

OKLAHOMA

TABLE D 5-28

TOTAL TITLE IV INSTITUTE PROJECT GRANTS BY STATE, SPONSOR, AND FISCAL YEAR (All States Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Univ. of Okla. Norman	527,669		62,044	166,719	298,906	--	--	--	--
Univ. of Tulsa Tulsa	107,381		73,527	33,854	--	--	--	--	--
Langston Univ. Langston	68,911		34,630	34,281	--	--	--	--	--
TOTAL	703,961		170,201	234,854	298,906	--	--	--	--

OREGON

TABLE D 5-29

TOTAL TITLE IV INSTITUTE PROJECT GRANTS BY STATE, SPONSOR, AND FISCAL YEAR (All States Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
University of Oregon, Eugene	79,893		--	73,988	5,905	--	--	--	--
Portland State Univ., Portland	11,954		--	--	--	--	--	--	11,954
TOTAL	91,847		--	73,988	5,905	--	--	--	11,954

PENNSYLVANIA

TABLE D 5-30

TOTAL TITLE IV INSTITUTE PROJECT GRANTS BY STATE, SPONSOR, AND FISCAL YEAR (All States Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Pa. Military College, Chester	106,361		36,954	69,407	--	--	--	--	--
Cheyney State College, Cheyney	46,330		--	--	--	--	--	--	46,330
Univ. of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh	18,972		--	--	--	--	--	--	18,972
TOTAL	171,663		36,954	69,407	--	--	--	--	65,302

SOUTH CAROLINA

TABLE D 5-31

TOTAL TITLE IV INSTITUTE PROJECT GRANTS BY STATE, SPONSOR, AND FISCAL YEAR (All States Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Claflin College Orangeburg	33,392		--	--	33,392	--	--	--	--
TOTAL	33,392		--	--	33,392	--	--	--	--

TENNESSEE

TABLE D 5-32

TOTAL TITLE IV INSTITUTE PROJECT GRANTS BY STATE, SPONSOR, AND FISCAL YEAR (All States Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Univ. of Tenn. Knoxville	402,434		182,508	212,258	97,668	--	--	--	--
George Peabody College, Nashville	103,751		103,751	--	--	--	--	--	--
Fisk Univ. Nashville	159,865		83,130	76,735	--	--	--	--	--
Knoxville College Knoxville	152,181		26,821	69,360	56,000	--	--	--	--
Tennessee A&T Univ., Nashville	31,704		31,704	--	--	--	--	--	--
Univ. of Tenn. Martin	39,927		--	--	39,927	--	--	--	--
TOTAL	979,862		427,914	358,353	193,595	--	--	--	--

TEXAS

TABLE 5-33

TOTAL TITLE IV INSTITUTE PROJECT GRANTS BY STATE, SPONSOR, AND FISCAL YEAR (All States Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Lemar St. Col. Beaumont	19,578		19,578	--	--	--	--	--	--
Univ. of St. Thomas, Houston	136,614		50,473	--	46,721	39,420	--	--	--
Texas Southern Univ., Houston	311,389		--	63,835	211,654	35,900	--	--	--
Texas A&M Univ. College Station	37,575		--	--	--	37,575	--	--	--
Paul Quinn Col. Waco	43,088		--	--	--	43,088	--	--	--
Sam Houston Col. Huntsville	53,125		--	--	--	53,125	--	--	--
Prairie View A&M, Prairie View	93,762		--	--	--	51,762	42,000	--	--
East Texas State Univ., Commerce	42,000		--	--	--	--	42,000	--	--
Bishop College	80,000		--	--	--	--	30,000	--	50,000

VIRGINIA

TOTAL TITLE IV INSTITUTE PROJECT GRANTS BY STATE, SPONSOR, AND FISCAL YEAR (All States Receiving Grants) TABLE D 5-34

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Old Dominion Col., Norfolk	5,603		--	5,603	--	--	--	--	--
Virginia Union Univ, Richmond	16,860		--	16,860	--	--	--	--	--
Lynchburg Col. Lynchburg	48,875		--	48,875	--	--	--	--	--
Virginia State Col., Norfolk	95,411		--	57,438	37,973	--	--	--	--
Hampton Institute Hampton	245,360		--	86,360	159,000	--	--	--	--
Univ. of Va. Charlottesville	167,606		--	--	167,606	--	--	--	--
St. Paul's Col. Lawrenceville	18,204		--	--	18,204	--	--	--	--
Norfolk State Col., Norfolk	35,000		--	--	--	--	35,000	--	--

Va. (Cont.)

TABLE D 5-35

TOTAL TITLE IV INSTITUTE PROJECT GRANTS BY STATE, SPONSOR, AND FISCAL YEAR (All States Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Central Va.Comm. Coll.,Lynchburg	7,238		--	--	--	--	--	--	7,238
Va. State Col. Petersburg	13,618		--	--	--	--	--	--	13,618
Va. Highlands Comm. Coll. Abingdon	11,312		--	--	--	--	--	--	11,312
TOTAL	665,087		--	215,136	382,753	--	35,000	--	32,168

WASHINGTON

TABLE D 5-36

TOTAL TITLE IV INSTITUTE PROJECT GRANTS BY STATE, SPONSOR, AND FISCAL YEAR (All States Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Seattle Univ. Seattle	120,416		--	--	--	84,656	--	--	35,760
TOTAL	120,416		--	--	--	84,656	--	--	35,760

WEST VIRGINIA

TABLE D 5-37

TOTAL TITLE IV INSTITUTE PROJECT GRANTS BY STATE, SPONSOR, AND FISCAL YEAR (All States Receiving Grants)

	TOTAL		1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
West Virginia Wesleyan Col.	107,153		--	27,706	--	14,313	[illegible]	--	--
Marshall Univ. Huntington	17,049		--	--	--	--	--	--	17,049
Total	124,202		--	27,706	--	14,313	65,420	--	17,049

☆ U.S. Government Printing Office: 1973 O—479-302